arXiv:1609.03779v1 [math.ST] 13 Sep 2016

NON-ASYMPTOTIC UPPER BOUNDS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION ERROR OF PCA

MARKUS REISS AND MARTIN WAHL

Abstract. Principal component analysis (PCA) is a standard tool for dimension reduction. In this paper, we analyse the reconstruction error of PCA and prove non-asymptotic upper bounds for the corresponding excess risk. These bounds unify and improve several upper bounds from the literature. Moreover, the bounds reveal that the excess risk differs considerably from usually considered subspace distances based on canonical angles. Our approach relies on the analysis of empirical spectral projectors combined with concentration inequalities for weighted empirical covariance operators and empirical eigenvalues. The results are illustrated for covariance matrices satisfying standard eigenvalue decay assumptions. In addition, corresponding bounds for canonical angle distances are discussed.

1. Introduction

Principal component analysis (PCA) is one of the simplest and most widely used dimension reduction procedures. Variants like functional or kernel PCA can be included in the standard multivariate setting by allowing for general Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$. PCA is commonly derived by minimising the reconstruction error $\mathbb{E}[\|X - PX\|^2]$ over all orthogonal projections P of rank d, where X is an $\mathcal{H}$-valued random variable and d is a given dimension. Replacing the population covariance Σ by an empirical covariance $\hat{\Sigma}$, PCA computes the orthogonal projection $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ onto the eigenspace of the d leading eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Put differently, $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ minimises the empirical reconstruction error and it is natural to measure its performance by the excess risk $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$, i.e. the difference between the reconstruction errors of $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ and the overall minimiser $P_{\leqslant d}$. It is easy to see (and derived below) that $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = \langle \Sigma, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle$ holds with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt scalar product.

Bounds for the reconstruction error have been rarely studied in the literature so far, the main reference is Blanchard, Bousquet, and Zwald [8], see also Shawe-Taylor et al. [28]. In [8], the authors apply results from the theory of empirical risk minimisation and derive several non-asymptotic concentration bounds.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 62H25; secondary 15A42, 60F10.

Key words and phrases. Principal component analysis, Reconstruction error, Excess risk, Spectral projectors, Concentration inequalities.

Classical results for PCA provide limit theorems for the empirical eigenvalues and eigenvectors when the sample size n tends to infinity, see e.g. Anderson [3] and Dauxois, Pousse and Romain [12]. Generalisations, such as stochastic expansions, are derived in Hall and Hosseini-Nasab [13] and Jirak [14]. Many authors have studied empirical spectral projectors (such as $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$) when the distance to the population spectral projectors is measured in operator or Hilbert-Schmidt norm, see e.g. Zwald and Blanchard [32], Nadler [27], Mas and Ruymgaart [25], and Koltchinskii and Lounici [18, 19, 20]. A different line of research imposes sparsity constraints to tackle high-dimensional PCA with a focus on spiked covariance models, see e.g. Vu and Lei [30] and Cai, Ma, and Wu [10, 11].

In most cases the analysis of empirical spectral projectors is based on methods from perturbation theory for linear operators. Non-asymptotic bounds often use the Davis-Kahan $\sin\Theta$ theorem and variants of it [32, 30, 10]. Asymptotically more precise results can be obtained by using linear or higher order expansions of empirical spectral projectors, see [25, 18, 19, 20] and also Koltchinskii and Giné [16] and Koltchinskii [21]. These methods can also be applied to the excess risk, leading to several asymptotic and non-asymptotic results which hold under the assumption that the spectral gap $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}$ between the dth and $(d+1)$th largest eigenvalue of Σ is positive. There is, however, a completely different reason for which the excess risk might be small, due to the weighting with Σ in $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$. For instance, it is easy to see that the excess risk is small if all eigenvalues are nearby. In the extreme isotropic case $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$, the excess risk satisfies $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = 0$.

In this paper, we explore in detail the above introduced dichotomy of the behaviour of the excess risk with respect to the size of the spectral gaps $\lambda_j - \lambda_k$ with $j \leqslant d$ and $k > d$. This leads to the difficulty that we have to deal with empirical spectral projectors without spectral gap conditions. For that reason, we will replace methods from perturbation theory for linear operators by purely algebraic projector-based calculations, resulting in two completely different methods to bound the excess risk. Moreover, to combine these two methods appropriately, we will develop spectral concentration inequalities which take into account the local eigenvalue structure.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we formalise the setting and provide some preliminary results. A parametric limit theorem for the excess risk with rate n^{-1} is derived, exhibiting already in the parametric situation a remarkable discontinuity when spectral gaps become small. Moreover, the approach of Blanchard, Bousquet, and Zwald [8] is discussed, including a simple recursion argument for one of their local bounds. Calling for more precise bounds, Section 3 develops empirical projector expansions, a deterministic error decomposition for $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$, and spectral concentration inequalities as main mathematical concepts. This leads to our main bounds for the excess risk in Section 4, which unify and improve previously obtained bounds. We present upper bounds for $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$ as well as for $\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2$

which can be obtained by a linear expansion of $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$, showing the versatility of the projector calculus in combination with the local spectral concentration results. Finally, the general upper bounds are applied to three main classes of eigenvalue behaviour. More technical proofs are gathered in the Appendices A-J.

2. The reconstruction error of PCA

Notation. Let X be a centered random variable taking values in a separable Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ of dimension $p \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{+\infty\}$ and let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the norm on $\mathcal{H}$ defined by $\|u\| = \sqrt{\langle u, u\rangle}$.

2.1. **Assumption.** *Suppose that X is sub-Gaussian, meaning that $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|^2]$ is finite and that there is a constant C_1 with*

$$\|\langle X, u\rangle\|_{\psi_2} := \sup_{k\geqslant 1} k^{-1/2}\mathbb{E}\big[|\langle X, u\rangle|^k\big]^{1/k} \leqslant C_1\mathbb{E}[\langle X, u\rangle^2]^{1/2}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$.

If the covariance operator of X is denoted by

$$\Sigma = \mathbb{E}[X \otimes X],$$

then by the spectral theorem there exists a sequence $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^p$ of eigenvalues (in decreasing order) together with an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors $(u_j)_{j=1}^p$ such that Σ has the spectral representation

$$\Sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j P_j,$$

with rank-one projectors $P_j = u_j \otimes u_j$. Note that the choice of u_j and P_j is non-unique in case of multiple eigenvalues λ_j. Here, for $u, v \in \mathcal{H}$ we denote by $u \otimes v$ the rank-one operator defined by $(u \otimes v)x = \langle v, x\rangle u$, $x \in \mathcal{H}$. We write

$$P_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d} P_j, \quad P_{>d} = I - P_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{k>d} P_k$$

for the orthogonal projections onto the linear subspace spanned by the first d eigenvectors of Σ, and onto its orthogonal complement.

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be n independent copies of X and let

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \otimes X_i$$

be the sample covariance. Again, there exist eigenvalues $(\hat{\lambda}_j)_{j=1}^p$ (in decreasing order) and eigenvectors $(\hat{u}_j)_{j=1}^p$ such that we can write

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \hat{\lambda}_j \hat{P}_j \text{ with } \hat{P}_j = \hat{u}_j \otimes \hat{u}_j \text{ and } \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d} \hat{P}_j,\ \hat{P}_{>d} = \sum_{k>d} \hat{P}_k.$$

For linear operators $S, T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ we make use of trace and adjoint $\mathrm{tr}(S), S^*$ to define the Hilbert-Schmidt or Frobenius norm and scalar product

$$\|S\|_2^2 = \mathrm{tr}(S^*S), \quad \langle S, T\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(S^*T)$$

as well as the operator norm $\|S\|_\infty = \max_{u\in\mathcal{H},\|u\|=1}\|Su\|$. For covariance operators Σ this gives $\|\Sigma\|_\infty = \lambda_1$ and $\|\Sigma\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^2$. In addition, for $r \geqslant 1$, we use the abbreviations $\mathrm{tr}_{\leqslant r}(\Sigma)$, $\mathrm{tr}_{<r}(\Sigma)$, $\mathrm{tr}_{>r}(\Sigma)$, $\mathrm{tr}_{\geqslant r}(\Sigma)$ for $\sum_{j\leqslant r}\lambda_j$, $\sum_{j<r}\lambda_j$, $\sum_{j>r}\lambda_j$, and $\sum_{j\geqslant r}\lambda_j$, respectively.

Introducing the class

$$\mathcal{P}_d = \{P : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H} \,|\, P \text{ is orthogonal projection of rank } d\},$$

the (population) reconstruction error of $P \in \mathcal{P}_d$ is defined by

$$R(P) = \mathbb{E}[\|X - PX\|^2] = \langle \Sigma, I - P\rangle.$$

The fundamental idea behind PCA is that $P_{\leqslant d}$ satisfies (compare with (K.3) below)

$$P_{\leqslant d} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{P\in\mathcal{P}_d} R(P). \tag{2.1}$$

Similarly, the empirical reconstruction error of $P \in \mathcal{P}_d$ is defined by

$$R_n(P) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i - PX_i\|^2 = \langle \hat{\Sigma}, I - P\rangle,$$

and we have

$$\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{P\in\mathcal{P}_d} R_n(P). \tag{2.2}$$

The excess risk of the PCA projector $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ is thus given by

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} := R(\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}) - R(P_{\leqslant d}) = \langle \Sigma, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle. \tag{2.3}$$

By (2.1) the excess risk $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$ defines a non-negative loss function in the decision-theoretic sense for the estimator $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ under the parameter Σ. Our main objective is to find non-asymptotic bounds for $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}]$, the decision-theoretic risk.

Throughout the paper, c and C are constants depending only on C_1 from Assumption 2.1. We make use of the convention that the constants c, C need not represent the same value at each occurrence. At some points, however, we make C more explicit by using the additional constant $C_2 > 0$ which is the smallest constant such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_j(\Sigma - \hat{\Sigma})P_k\|_2^2] \leqslant C_2\delta\lambda_j\lambda_k/n \tag{2.4}$$

with $\delta = 1$ if $j \neq k$ and $\delta = 2$ otherwise. Note that we always have $C_2 \leqslant 16C_1^4$ and that for X Gaussian we have equality in (2.4) with $C_2 = 1$.

Subspace distance versus excess risk. Many results cover the Hilbert-Schmidt distance $\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2$, which has a geometric interpretation in terms of canonical angles. For instance, it is known that for $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$ and $X \sim N(0, \Sigma)$ with fixed Σ in the case $\lambda_d > \lambda_{d+1}$

$$n\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \xrightarrow{d} 2\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{\lambda_j\lambda_k}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2}g_{jk}^2 \tag{2.5}$$

holds as $n \to \infty$, where $(g_{jk})_{j\leqslant d<k}$ is an array of independent standard Gaussian random variables. The proof can be based on perturbation theory for linear operators combined with concentration inequalities for sample covariance operators as developed in Koltchinskii and Lounici [17, 18]. By [18, Lemma 2], we have

$$\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d} = -\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\Big(\frac{P_j\Delta P_k + P_k\Delta P_j}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\Big) + R, \text{ where } \Delta = \Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}, \tag{2.6}$$

with a remainder $R = R(\Delta)$ satisfying

$$\|R\|_\infty \leqslant 15\Big(1 + \frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\lambda_1-\lambda_d}{\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1}}\Big)\Big(\frac{\|\Delta\|_\infty}{\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1}}\Big)^2.$$

The fundamental non-asymptotic result in [17] asserts that under Assumption 2.1, there exists a constant $C_3 > 1$ depending only on C_1 such that, for all $t \geqslant 1$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$,

$$\|\Delta\|_\infty \leqslant C_3\lambda_1\Big(\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{r}(\Sigma)}{n}} \bigvee \frac{\mathrm{r}(\Sigma)}{n} \bigvee \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \bigvee \frac{t}{n}\Big), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathrm{r}(\Sigma) = \mathrm{tr}(\Sigma)/\lambda_1$. Since the remainder R in (2.6) is of rank at most $4d$, we obtain that $\sqrt{n}\|R\|_2$ converges to zero in probability and (2.5) follows from invoking a standard central limit theorem (see e.g. Dauxois, Pousse and Romain [12, Proposition 5]).

As we can see from the asymptotic result (2.5), estimation of $P_{\leqslant d}$ becomes highly unstable in the loss $\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2$ when the spectral gap $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}$ is small. In the extreme case $\lambda_d = \lambda_{d+1}$ that loss depends on the choice of (u_d, u_{d+1}) and is thus even not well-defined.

For the reconstruction error, however, a small spectral gap $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}$ means that contributions of $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ in direction of u_{d+1} have only small impact on the excess risk. This is plainly visible in the isotropic case $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$, where $R(P) = \sigma^2(p-d)$ holds for any $P \in \mathcal{P}_d$, implying $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = 0$. At a mathematical level the reconstruction error loss induces a weighting of the subspace distance in different directions which calls for a local analysis of the projector angles $\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle$ and $\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle$ without using the linearisation in (2.6).

The projector calculus developed in Section 3.1 allows to obtain readily the analogue of the asymptotic result (2.5) for the excess risk $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$ without

any spectral gap condition. The decomposition from (J.2) yields

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_d)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_k)^2} + \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_j\|_2^2}{(\hat{\lambda}_j-\lambda_k)^2},$$

whenever the denominators are non-zero. In fact, the first sum only extends over all j with $\lambda_j > \lambda_d$ and the last sum only over all k with $\lambda_k < \lambda_d$ and we prove in Appendix J:

2.2. **Proposition.** *Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$ and $X \sim N(0,\Sigma)$ with Σ fixed. As $n\to\infty$ we have for the excess risk $\mathcal{E}_{d,n}^{PCA} = \mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$*

$$n\mathcal{E}_{d,n}^{PCA} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_j>\lambda_k}} \frac{\lambda_j\lambda_k}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}g_{jk}^2,$$

where $(g_{jk})_{j\leqslant d<k}$ are independent standard Gaussian random variables.

We see that the excess risk $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$ converges with n^{-1}-rate also in the case $\lambda_d = \lambda_{d+1}$. Remark, however, that even in a classical setting, where p is small compared to n, inference based on this asymptotic result is doubtful. If the excess risk is considered as a process in the eigenvalues $(\lambda_j)_{j=1}^p$, then for fixed n this process is continuous whereas the limiting laws are not tight as $\lambda_{d+1}\uparrow\lambda_d$. Consequently, the convergence is not uniform in the parameter Σ.

Local versus global bounds. The fact that the excess risk in Proposition 2.2 converges for fixed Σ with rate n^{-1} is clearly misleading. For $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$ and $X\sim N(0,\Sigma)$, a standard parametric contiguity argument can be applied to infer that the maximal excess risk, taken over all covariances Σ, cannot converge faster than with $n^{-1/2}$-rate. A more advanced non-asymptotic lower bound is available, additionally describing the dependence on the dimensions p and d. Consider for $x>0$, the class $I+x\mathcal{P}_d$ of all covariance matrices of the form $\Sigma = I+xP$ with arbitrary $P\in\mathcal{P}_d$. Since $\langle I+xP, P-Q\rangle = \frac{x}{2}\|P-Q\|_2^2$ for any $P,Q\in\mathcal{P}_d$, the minimax lower bound derived in Cai, Ma, and Wu [10, Theorem 8], which is proven exactly for the class $I+x\mathcal{P}_{\leqslant d}$ using the local metric entropy of the Grassmann manifold yields

$$\inf_{\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}}\sup_{\Sigma\in(I+x\mathcal{P}_{\leqslant d})}\mathbb{E}[\langle\Sigma, P_{\leqslant d}-\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle] \geqslant c\min\Big(\frac{(1+x)d(p-d)}{nx}, dx, (p-d)x\Big), \tag{2.8}$$

where the infimum is taken over all estimators $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ based on $X_1,\dots,X_n$ with values in $\mathcal{P}_d$ and $c>0$ is a constant. For $d\leqslant p/2$ and for the spectral gap $x=\sqrt{p/n}$ the lower bound (2.8) is at least of order $d\sqrt{p/n}$.

This significant difference between a global uniform and a local individual bound has been discovered and studied in detail by Blanchard, Bousquet,

and Zwald [8]. The important basic inequality, underlying their analysis of $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$, is

$$0 \leqslant \langle \Sigma, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle \leqslant \langle \Sigma - \hat{\Sigma}, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle = \langle \Delta, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle, \tag{2.9}$$

which follows from the variational characterisations in (2.1) and (2.2). Note that (2.9) follows also from the basic technique to control the excess risk in empirical risk minimisation by adding the empirical excess risk. Although we shall see below that this often leads to suboptimal results, let us present here some (preliminary) non-asymptotic bounds which can be easily obtained from (2.9).

2.3. **Proposition.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \min\Big(\sqrt{2d}\|\Delta\|_2,\ \frac{2\|\Delta\|_2^2}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}\Big)$$

with the convention $x/0 := \infty$. With Assumption 2.1

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant \min\Big(\frac{\sqrt{4C_2 d}\,\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma)}{\sqrt{n}},\ \frac{4C_2\,\mathrm{tr}(\Sigma)^2}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1})}\Big) \tag{2.10}$$

follows, where C_2 is the constant in (2.4).

2.4. **Remark.** Proposition 2.3 can be compared to the concentration inequalities established in the second part of Theorem 3.1 and in Theorem 3.2 by [8]. For that, sophisticated arguments from empirical process theory are applied, based on Bartlett, Bousquet, and Mendelson [5]. The expectation bounds here follow from a short recursion argument to obtain the fast n^{-1}-rate and merely require a fourth moment bound instead of the full Assumption 2.1. Both approaches yield global bounds of the same order, while the local bound in [8] is due to its complexity difficult to compare, but does not seem to give better results in the case $\lambda_d > \lambda_{d+1}$. In [8] there is also a third bound, called relative bound, which is of different flavour.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. From (2.9) we obtain

$$(\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA})^2 \leqslant \|\Delta\|_2^2 \|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \tag{2.11}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Since orthogonal projectors are idempotent and self-adjoint, we have $\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle = \|P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \geqslant 0$, cf. (L.4) below, and thus

$$\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 = 2(d - \langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle) \leqslant 2d.$$

Insertion into (2.11) yields the first part of the bound. Moreover, we have

$$\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant \frac{2}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}} \langle \Sigma, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle = \frac{2\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}},$$

which is a variant of the Davis-Kahan inequality and follows by simple projector calculus, see Remark 3.2 below. We obtain

$$(\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA})^2 \leqslant \|\Delta\|_2^2 \frac{2\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}.$$

This yields the second part of the bound. Finally, the expectation bound (2.10) follows from inserting (2.4). □

For $\Sigma = I + xP_{\leqslant d}$ we merely obtain the global rate $p\sqrt{d/n}$ instead of $d\sqrt{p/n}$ in the lower bound. This is significantly worse for high dimensions p, but can be cured using the variational characterisations (2.1), (2.2) again:

2.5. **Proposition.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \langle \Delta, P_{\leqslant d}\rangle + \langle -\Delta, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant d} \lambda_j(\Delta) + \sum_{j\leqslant d} \lambda_j(-\Delta), \tag{2.12}$$

where the eigenvalues $\lambda_j(\Delta)$ and $\lambda_j(-\Delta)$ are defined in Appendix K. In particular, if Assumption 2.1 holds, then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C \sum_{j\leqslant d} \max\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant j}(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{\operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant j}(\Sigma)}{n}\right).$$

Proof. Using (2.9), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \langle \Delta, P_{\leqslant d}\rangle + \langle -\Delta, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}_d} \langle \Delta, P\rangle + \sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}_d} \langle -\Delta, P\rangle$$

and (2.12) follows from (K.3).

Noting $\mathbb{E}[\langle \Delta, P_{\leqslant d}\rangle] = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant d} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_j(-\Delta)]. \tag{2.13}$$

The expectation bound now follows from combining the min-max theorem with the moment bound for sample covariance operators obtained by Koltchinskii and Lounici [17]. Indeed, (K.1) implies

$$\sum_{j\leqslant d} \lambda_j(-\Delta) \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant d} \lambda_1(P_{\geqslant j}(-\Delta)P_{\geqslant j}) \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant d} \|P_{\geqslant j}\Delta P_{\geqslant j}\|_\infty.$$

Now consider $X' = P_{\geqslant j}X$, $X_i' = P_{\geqslant j}X_i$ which again satisfy Assumption 2.1 (with the same constant C_1) and lead to the covariance and sample covariance

$$\Sigma' = P_{\geqslant j}\Sigma P_{\geqslant j}, \quad \hat{\Sigma}' = P_{\geqslant j}\hat{\Sigma}P_{\geqslant j}. \tag{2.14}$$

Since Σ' has trace $\operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant j}(\Sigma)$ and operator norm $\lambda_1' = \lambda_j$, the deviation bound (2.7) for $\Delta' = \Sigma' - \hat{\Sigma}'$, cf. also [17, Theorem 4], gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\geqslant j}\Delta P_{\geqslant j}\|_\infty] \leqslant C \max\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant j}(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{\operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant j}(\Sigma)}{n}\right),$$

where C is a constant depending only on C_1. Summing over j gives the second claim. □

The preliminary bounds in Propositions 2.3 and 2.5 exhibit nicely the interplay between the global $n^{-1/2}$-rate and the local n^{-1}-rate in the case of a spectral gap $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1} > 0$. In most cases, however, they are suboptimal. First, for large n, the local bound in (2.10) is in general much weaker than the



FIGURE 1. Expected excess risk (solid) with the three upper bounds in (2.9) (dashed-dotted line), (2.13) (dotted line), and (4.7) below (dashed line) as functions of the spectral gap x.

asymptotic statement in Proposition 2.2, see e.g. the standard examples of polynomial and exponential eigenvalue decay discussed in Section 4.4 below. Second, the bounds obtained so far do not provide a correct picture of the expected excess risk in the case of small or vanishing spectral gaps. For the simple isotropic case $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$ with $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = 0$ they only provide an upper bound of order $d\sqrt{p/n}$ and this is directly due to using the basic inequality (2.9). When the excess risk is small, the risk $\langle \hat{\Sigma}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d} \rangle$ with the population and empirical versions exchanged may be large. For the lower bound model $\Sigma = I + xP_{\leq d}$ with $n = 500$, $p = 40$, and $d = 15$, Figure 1 displays the expectation of the upper bound from the basic inequality (2.9) (dashed-dotted line) and the upper bound (2.13), used for proving Proposition 2.5 (dotted line), compared to the expected excess risk (solid line). All values are obtained from accurate Monte Carlo simulations. As argued above, we see that for small spectral gaps x, the behaviour of the excess risk is not captured as soon as the basic inequality is used. In comparison, Figure 1 also displays the upper bound obtained in Section 4.4 below with $C = 1.1$, taking into account Remark 3.5 on the constants (dashed line), which shows that the right behaviour of the excess risk can be described by the minimum of two different bounds. The next section develops a refined theory to obtain tighter and unified upper bounds for the excess risk.

3. Main Tools

3.1. **Projector-based calculus.** In this section, we present several formulas which form the basis of our analysis of the excess risk. We begin with the following spectral representation of the excess risk.

3.1. **Lemma.** *For any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = \sum_{j \leqslant d} (\lambda_j - \mu) \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle + \sum_{k > d} (\mu - \lambda_k) \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle.$$

Proof. Inserting the spectral representation of Σ, the excess risk can be written as

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = \langle \Sigma, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda_j \langle P_j, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle.$$

By $P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} = \hat{P}_{>d} - P_{>d}$ from (L.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} &= \sum_{j \leqslant d} \lambda_j \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} - P_{>d} \rangle - \sum_{k > d} \lambda_k \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j \leqslant d} \lambda_j \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle - \sum_{k > d} \lambda_k \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = \langle P_{>d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle$ from (L.3) implies $\sum_{j \leqslant d} \mu \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = \sum_{k > d} \mu \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle$ and the claim follows. □

3.2. **Remark.** Applying Lemma 3.1 with $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$ and using $\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle \geqslant 0$ via (L.1), we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \geqslant (\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}) \langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = \frac{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}{2} \|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2.$$

This means that all excess error bounds a fortiori imply bounds on the Hilbert-Schmidt distance up to a spectral gap factor. Moreover, in our setting most versions of the powerful Davis-Kahan inequality, e.g. those in Yu, Wang and Samworth [31], follow directly from this inequality by using the basic inequality (2.9) $\langle \Delta, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle \geqslant \mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}$ and bounding the scalar product by a Cauchy-Schwarz or operator norm inequality.

Usually, we shall choose $\mu \in [\lambda_{d+1}, \lambda_d]$ such that all terms are positive, but for exponential decay, for instance, it pays off to choose $\mu = 0$, see Section 4.14 for details.

Next, we derive an expansion of the quantities $\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle$ and $\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle$, which appear in Lemma 3.1. As explained in Section 2, we do not use the linearisation formula in (2.6), since it might be the case that $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}$ is very small or even zero. In Section 4.3 below, we also discuss linear expansions.

3.3. **Lemma.** *For $j \leqslant d$ we have*

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = \sum_{k > d} \frac{\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_k)^2},$$

and for $k > d$ we have

$$\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle = \sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{\|P_k \Delta \hat{P}_j\|_2^2}{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k)^2}.$$

Both identities hold provided that all denominators are non-zero.

Proof. The main ingredient is the formula

$$P_j \hat{P}_k = \frac{1}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_k} P_j \Delta \hat{P}_k, \tag{3.1}$$

which follows from inserting the representation

$$\Delta = \Sigma - \hat{\Sigma} = \sum_{l\geqslant 1} \lambda_l P_l - \sum_{l\geqslant 1} \hat{\lambda}_l \hat{P}_l$$

into the right-hand side. Indeed,

$$P_j \Delta \hat{P}_k = \sum_{l\geqslant 1} \lambda_l P_j P_l \hat{P}_k - \sum_{l\geqslant 1} \hat{\lambda}_l P_j \hat{P}_l \hat{P}_k = (\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_k) P_j \hat{P}_k.$$

The identity $\langle P_j, \hat{P}_k\rangle = \|P_j \hat{P}_k\|_2^2$ from (L.1) combined with (3.1) gives

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_k\rangle = \frac{\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_k)^2}.$$

Summation over k gives the first claim. The second claim follows similarly by switching j and k and summation over j. □

3.2. **Deterministic error decomposition.** In this section, we prove deterministic upper bounds for the excess risk. By Lemma 3.1, the excess risk can be decomposed into

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} = \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} + \mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA},$$

where for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ the risk parts $\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} = \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA} = \mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}(\mu)$ are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} = \sum_{j\leqslant d} (\lambda_j - \mu)\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle, \quad \mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA} = \sum_{k>d} (\mu - \lambda_k)\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle.$$

It turns out that the two risk parts have different behaviour and we shall bound them separately.

For $\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}$ we split the sum into indices $j \leqslant r$, where we expect the spectral gaps $\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}$ to be small, meaning that we can insert the expansions of Proposition 3.3, and $r < j \leqslant d$, where wrong projections do not incur a large error because $\lambda_j - \mu$ is small. The terms of the first sum can then be controlled by a linearised and a deviation term in terms of a weighted operator norm of Δ, involving another index r_0.

3.4. **Proposition.** *For $\mu \in [\lambda_d, \lambda_{d+1}]$ and $r = 0, \dots, d$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} \leqslant & 4\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} + \sum_{r<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\mu) \\ & + \sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Furthermore, for $r_0 = r, \dots, d$ and the weighted projector

$$S_{\leqslant r_0} = S_{\leqslant r_0}(\mu) = \sum_{j\leqslant r_0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j-\mu}}P_j \tag{3.3}$$

(assuming $\lambda_{r_0} > \mu$) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} \leqslant & 16\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta P_{>r_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2\sum_{r<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\mu) \\ & + 2\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\big) \\ & + 8\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{\leqslant r_0}\Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

3.5. **Remark.** The constants are chosen for simplicity. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, the constant 16 in (3.4) can be replaced by $1+\varepsilon$ provided that the constants $1/2$ and $1/16$ in the definition of the events are replaced by smaller constants depending on ε.

Proof. Using $\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant 1$ from (L.2), we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA} = \sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\mu)\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle + \sum_{r<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\mu). \tag{3.5}$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle = \sum_{k>d}\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_k)^2}.$$

Moreover, on the event

$$\{\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} \leqslant (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\} = \{\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} \geqslant (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\}$$

we can bound

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant \sum_{k>d}4\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} = 4\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}. \tag{3.6}$$

By (3.6) and $\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant 1$, we conclude

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant 4\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} + \mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\big). \tag{3.7}$$

Inserting (3.7) into (3.5), we obtain the first claim (3.2). The second claim follows from an additional recursion argument. First, we introduce the operator

$$R_{\leqslant r_0} = R_{\leqslant r_0}(\mu) = \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \sqrt{\lambda_j - \mu} P_j,$$

which satisfies the identities

$$S_{\leqslant r_0} R_{\leqslant r_0} = P_{\leqslant r_0}$$

and

$$\sum_{j \leqslant r_0} (\lambda_j - \mu) \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} (\lambda_j - \mu) \|P_j \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 = \|R_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2. \tag{3.8}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \\
&\leqslant 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{>r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \\
&\leqslant 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{>r_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{\lambda_j - \mu} \\
&= 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{>r_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2 \|S_{\leqslant r} \Delta P_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

On the event $\{\|S_{\leqslant r_0} \Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty \leqslant 1/16\}$, the last term is bounded via

$$\begin{aligned}
2 \|S_{\leqslant r} \Delta P_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 &= 2 \|S_{\leqslant r} \Delta S_{\leqslant r_0} R_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 \\
&\leqslant 2 \|S_{\leqslant r} \Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty^2 \|R_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 \\
&\leqslant 2 \|S_{\leqslant r_0} \Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty^2 \|R_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 \leqslant \|R_{\leqslant r_0} \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 / 8,
\end{aligned}$$

where we also used the fact that $r \leqslant r_0$. Consequently, on the event $\{\|S_{\leqslant r_0} \Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty \leqslant 1/16\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \\
&\leqslant 2 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{>r_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} (\lambda_j - \mu) \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Using also that $\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 \leqslant \|P_j \Delta\|_2^2$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&4 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \\
&\leqslant 8 \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{>r_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ 4\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{\leqslant r_0}\Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\big).$$

Plugging this into (3.2), we obtain the second claim. □

Similarly, we can upper-bound the second risk part $\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}$. The only difference in the proof in Appendix A is that an additional argument deals with the sum over all sufficiently large k.

3.6. **Proposition.** *For $\mu\in[\lambda_d,\lambda_{d+1}]$ and $l=d+1,\dots,p+1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}\leqslant& 4\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}+\sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1}(\mu-\lambda_k)\\ &+\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k\geqslant\lambda_d/2}}(\mu-\lambda_k)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat\lambda_d-\lambda_d<-(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\big)\\ &+d(\mu-\lambda_p)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat\lambda_d-\lambda_d<-\lambda_d/4\big).\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

Furthermore, for $l_0=d+1,\dots,l$ and the weighted projector

$$S_{\geqslant l_0}=S_{\geqslant l_0}(\mu)=\sum_{k\geqslant l_0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu-\lambda_k}}P_k\tag{3.10}$$

(assuming $\mu>\lambda_{l_0}$) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}\leqslant& 16\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta P_{<l_0}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}+2\sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1}(\mu-\lambda_k)\\ &+2\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k\geqslant\lambda_d/2}}(\mu-\lambda_k)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat\lambda_d-\lambda_d<-(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\big)\\ &+2d(\mu-\lambda_p)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat\lambda_d-\lambda_d<-\lambda_d/4\big)\\ &+8\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}\mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{\geqslant l_0}\Delta S_{\geqslant l_0}\|_\infty>1/16\big).\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

3.7. **Remark.** For $p=\infty$ we understand $\lambda_p=0$ and $l\in\{k\in\mathbb{N}\,|\,k\geqslant d+1\}\cup\{+\infty\}$ and for $l=p=\infty$ we understand $\sum_{k=(l-d)\vee(d+1)}^{l-1}(\mu-\lambda_k)=d\mu$ in the above bound, noting $\lambda_k\downarrow 0$.

3.3. **Concentration inequalities.** In order to make the deterministic upper bounds of the previous section useful, one has to show that the events in the remainder terms occur with small probability. We establish concentration inequalities for the weighted sample covariance operators as well as deviation inequalities for the empirical eigenvalues $\hat\lambda_d$ and $\hat\lambda_{d+1}$, based on the concentration inequality (2.7) for sample covariance operators which we use in the form

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\Delta\|_\infty>C_3\lambda_1 x)\leqslant e^{-n(x\wedge x^2)},\tag{3.12}$$

whenever

$$\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma) \leqslant n\lambda_1(x \wedge x^2).$$

First, consider the weighted projector $S_{\leqslant r_0}$ from (3.3) for $\mu \in [0, \lambda_{r_0})$. Then, as in (2.14), $X' = S_{\leqslant r_0}X$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with the same constant C_1 as X and has covariance operator

$$\Sigma' = S_{\leqslant r_0}\Sigma S_{\leqslant r_0} = \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \mu} P_j.$$

The eigenvalues of Σ' (in decreasing order) are $\lambda'_j = \lambda_{r_0+1-j}/(\lambda_{r_0+1-j} - \mu)$, noting that the order is reversed by the weighting. Using the sample covariance $\hat{\Sigma}' = S_{\leqslant r_0}\hat{\Sigma}S_{\leqslant r_0}$ and choosing $x = 1/(16C_3\lambda'_1)$, which is smaller than 1, the concentration inequality (3.12) applied to $\Delta' = \Sigma' - \hat{\Sigma}'$ yields:

3.8. **Lemma.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. If $\mu \in [0, \lambda_{r_0})$ and if*

$$\frac{\lambda_{r_0}}{\lambda_{r_0} - \mu} \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \mu} \leqslant n/(256C_3^2)$$

holds with the constant C_3 from (3.12)*, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\|S_{\leqslant r_0}\Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\big) \leqslant \exp\bigg(- \frac{n(\lambda_{r_0} - \mu)^2}{256C_3^2\lambda_{r_0}^2}\bigg).$$

Similarly, if we consider the random variable $X' = S_{\geqslant l_0}X$ with $S_{\geqslant l_0}$ from (3.10) for $\mu > \lambda_{l_0}$, then for $x = (\mu - \lambda_{l_0})/(16C_3\lambda_{l_0})$ the concentration inequality (3.12) can be applied to $\Delta' = S_{\geqslant l_0}\Delta S_{\geqslant l_0}$, provided

$$\frac{\lambda_{l_0}}{\mu - \lambda_{l_0}} \sum_{k \geqslant l_0} \frac{\lambda_k}{\mu - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(256C_3^2), \quad \sum_{k \geqslant l_0} \frac{\lambda_k}{\mu - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(16C_3).$$

Noting $16C_3 \geqslant 1$, these two conditions can be unified and yield:

3.9. **Lemma.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. If $\mu > \lambda_{l_0}$ and if*

$$\frac{\mu}{\mu - \lambda_{l_0}} \sum_{k \geqslant l_0} \frac{\lambda_k}{\mu - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(256C_3^2)$$

holds with the constant C_3 from (3.12)*, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\|S_{\geqslant l_0}\Delta S_{\geqslant l_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\big) \leqslant \exp\bigg(- n \min\bigg(\frac{(\mu - \lambda_{l_0})^2}{256C_3^2\lambda_{l_0}^2}, \frac{\mu - \lambda_{l_0}}{16C_3\lambda_{l_0}}\bigg)\bigg).$$

Next, we will state deviation inequalities for the empirical eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_d$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}$, namely right-deviation inequalities for $\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}$ and left-deviation inequalities for $\hat{\lambda}_d$.

3.10. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. For all $x > 0$ satisfying*

$$\max\bigg(\frac{C_3\lambda_{d+1}}{x}, 1\bigg) \sum_{k > d} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_k + x} \leqslant n/C_3, \tag{3.13}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\hat\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > x\big) \leqslant \exp\bigg(- n \min\bigg(\frac{x^2}{C_3^2 \lambda_{d+1}^2}, \frac{x}{C_3 \lambda_{d+1}} \bigg)\bigg),$$

where C_3 is the constant in (3.12)*.*

Proof. First, we apply the min-max characterisation (K.1) of eigenvalues and obtain $\hat\lambda_{d+1} \leqslant \lambda_1(P_{>d}\hat\Sigma P_{>d})$. This gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > x) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\lambda_1(P_{>d}\hat\Sigma P_{>d}) - \lambda_1(P_{>d}\Sigma P_{>d}) > x). \tag{3.14}$$

We now use the following lemma (compare to [25, Lemma 18]), proven later.

3.11. **Lemma.** *Let S and T be self-adjoint, positive compact operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and $y > \lambda_1(S)$. Then:*

$$\lambda_1(T) > y \iff \lambda_1((y-S)^{-1/2}(T-S)(y-S)^{-1/2}) > 1.$$

Applying this lemma to $S = P_{>d}\Sigma P_{>d}$, $T = P_{>d}\hat\Sigma P_{>d}$, and $y = \lambda_1(S) + x = \lambda_{d+1} + x$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_1(P_{>d}\hat\Sigma P_{>d}) - \lambda_1(P_{>d}\Sigma P_{>d}) > x) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\|T_{>d}\Delta T_{>d}\|_\infty > 1) \tag{3.15}$$

with

$$T_{>d} = \sum_{k>d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_k + x}} P_k.$$

Thus, as in (2.14), we consider $X' = T_{>d}X$, satisfying Assumption 2.1 with the same constant C_1, and obtain the covariance operator

$$\Sigma' = T_{>d}\Sigma T_{>d} = \sum_{k>d} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_k + x} P_k.$$

Hence choosing

$$x' = \frac{1}{C_3 \lambda_1'} = \frac{x}{C_3 \lambda_{d+1}},$$

the concentration inequality (3.12), applied to $\Delta' = T_{>d}\Delta T_{>d}$ and x', gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T_{>d}\Delta T_{>d}\|_\infty > 1) \leqslant \exp\bigg(- n \min\bigg(\frac{x^2}{C_3^2 \lambda_{d+1}^2}, \frac{x}{C_3 \lambda_{d+1}} \bigg)\bigg) \tag{3.16}$$

in view of Condition (3.13). Combining (3.14)-(3.16), the claim follows.

It remains to prove Lemma 3.11. By (K.1), we have

$$\lambda_1\big((y-S)^{-1/2}(T-S)(y-S)^{-1/2}\big) \leqslant 1$$

if and only if (for the operator partial ordering, see Appendix K)

$$(y-S)^{-1/2}(y-T)(y-S)^{-1/2} = I - (y-S)^{-1/2}(T-S)(y-S)^{-1/2} \geqslant 0.$$

Since $(y-S)^{-1/2}$ is self-adjoint and strictly positive, this is the case if and only if $y - T \geqslant 0$, that is $\lambda_1(T) \leqslant y$. A logical negation yields the assertion of the lemma. □

In view of the error decompositions (3.2) and (3.4), we want to apply Theorem 3.10 with $x = (\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})/2$, $j \leqslant d$. For this, we need the condition

$$\max\left(\frac{2C_3\lambda_{d+1}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}}, 1\right) \sum_{k>d} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(2C_3).$$

Simplifying the maximum yields:

3.12. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and let $j \leqslant d$. Suppose that*

$$\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}} \sum_{k>d} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(4C_3^2). \tag{3.17}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > \frac{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}}{2}\Big) \leqslant \exp\Big(-n\min\Big(\frac{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}{4C_3^2\lambda_{d+1}^2}, \frac{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}}{2C_3\lambda_{d+1}}\Big)\Big). \tag{3.18}$$

The corresponding left-deviation result for $\hat{\lambda}_d$ is proved in Appendix B.

3.13. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. For all $x > 0$ satisfying*

$$\max\left(\frac{C_3\lambda_d}{x}, 1\right) \sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_d + x} \leqslant n/C_3, \tag{3.19}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -x\big) \leqslant \exp\left(-n\min\left(\frac{x^2}{C_3^2\lambda_d^2}, \frac{x}{C_3\lambda_d}\right)\right),$$

where C_3 is the constant in (3.12).

In particular, choosing $x = (\lambda_d - \lambda_k)/2$, we get:

3.14. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and let $k > d$. Suppose that*

$$\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_d - \lambda_k} \sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(4C_3^2). \tag{3.20}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)/2\big) \leqslant 2\exp\left(-\frac{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2}{C_3^2\lambda_d^2}\right). \tag{3.21}$$

3.15. **Remark.** Let us consider the interesting special case $j = r_0 = d$, $k = l_0 = d+1$, and $\mu = (\lambda_d + \lambda_{d+1})/2$. Then all four conditions in Lemmas 3.8, 3.9 and Corollaries 3.12, 3.14 are implied by

$$\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}\left(\sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}} + \sum_{k>d} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_d - \lambda_k}\right) \leqslant n/(1024C_3^2). \tag{3.22}$$

In particular, if (3.22) holds, then all events in Propositions 3.4 and 3.6 occur with small probability.

The local analysis of this section can be compared to the following global one. All events considered in Lemmas 3.8, 3.9 and Corollaries 3.12, 3.14 are

contained in $\{\|\Delta\|_\infty > (\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1})/32\}$ and by (3.12) this occurs with small probability if

$$\frac{\lambda_1 \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \leqslant n/(1024 C_3^2) \tag{3.23}$$

The latter condition is underlying the analysis in Koltchinskii and Lounici [18, 19]. Much of our mathematical difficulties come from showing that this condition can be replaced by the localised version in (3.22).

3.16. **Remark.** Concentration inequalities for eigenvalues using tools from measure concentration can be found in [23, 26, 24, 1, 9, 6]. The main difference to our deviation inequalities is that we take into account the local eigenvalue structure (see also Mas and Ruymgaart [25, Lemmas 16 and 17] for a similar result using the resolvent calculus). Let us discuss two special cases.

If we consider the largest eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix in the case $\Sigma = I$ (i.e. $d = 0$ in Theorem 3.10 and $d = 1$ in Theorem 3.13), Conditions (3.13) and (3.19) say that $\sqrt{p/n} \vee p/n \leqslant x/C_3$ and Theorems 3.10 and 3.13 give a well known concentration inequality (see e.g. Koltchinskii and Lounici [17, Theorem 1]) which describes the large deviation behaviour. Note that if $n/p \to c > 0$, then typical deviations are at a scale $n^{-2/3}$, see e.g. Johnstone [15] and Baik, Ben Arous, and Péché [4].

On the other hand, if λ_{d+1} is a simple eigenvalue, then Theorems 3.10 and 3.13 can be seen as a non-asymptotic version of the classical central limit theorem $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1}) \to \mathcal{N}(0, 2\lambda_{d+1}^2)$ which holds if X is e.g. Gaussian, compare to Anderson [2, Theorem 13.5.1] and Dauxois, Pousse and Romain [12, Proposition 8]. Moreover, Conditions (3.13) and (3.19) (resp. Condition (3.22)) are related to $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}]$ by the following asymptotic expansion (see e.g. [27, Equation (2.22)])

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}] = \lambda_{d+1} + \frac{\lambda_{d+1}}{n} \sum_{k \neq d+1} \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_{d+1} - \lambda_k} + \dots .$$

4. Main upper bounds for the excess risk

4.1. **A first non-asymptotic upper bound.** A first bound for the expectation of the excess risk follows from combining the deterministic bounds in (3.2) and (3.9) with the deviation inequalities in Corollaries 3.12 and 3.14. This first upper bound improves the local bound of Section 2 and gives the value 0 in the isotropic case $\Sigma = \sigma^2 I$. Moreover, global bounds emerge as trade-offs between the two different methods by which we had bounded the excess risk in Section 3.2. Note that the main goal of the present section is to show that there is a single bound which unifies the different bounds described in Section 2. Using the more sophisticated deterministic bounds in (3.4) and (3.11), we will derive the final main result in the next section.

The technical details of the following result, in particular the way the deviation bounds can be incorporated, are given in Appendix C.

4.1. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. For $\mu \in [\lambda_d, \lambda_{d+1}]$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}] \leqslant \sum_{j \leqslant d} (\lambda_j - \mu) \min\left(C \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}, 1 \right),$$

where $C = 8C_2 + 4C_3^2$.

Bounds of the same order can be derived for L^p-norms of $\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}$ with a constant C depending additionally on p, see e.g. Lemma F.2 for the additional arguments needed in the case $p = 2$. Similarly, we have:

4.2. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and suppose $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$. For $\mu \in [\lambda_d, \lambda_{d+1}]$ and all $l = d+1, \dots, p+1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}] \\ &\leqslant C \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + \sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1} (\mu - \lambda_k) + (\mu - \lambda_p) e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}},\end{aligned}$$

where $C = 8C_2 + 8C_3^2$. In particular, this implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}] \leqslant \sum_{k > d} (\mu - \lambda_k) \min\left(C \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2}, 1 \right) + (\mu - \lambda_p) e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}.$$

Note that for $p = \infty$ the convention of Remark 3.7 is still in force. Theorem 4.2 follows from (3.9), Corollary 3.14, and Theorem 3.13, the details can be found in Appendix D.

Summing up the inequalities in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 leads to an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_d]$. In view of the limit structure in Proposition 2.2 and the global bound of Propositions 2.3 and 2.5 we derive simple local and global bounds.

4.3. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and suppose $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$. Then we have the local bound*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_d] \leqslant C \sum_{\substack{j \leqslant d: \\ \lambda_j > \lambda_{d+1}}} \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})} + C \sum_{\substack{k > d: \\ \lambda_k < \lambda_d}} \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)} + \lambda_d e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}$$

and the global bound

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_d] \leqslant \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sqrt{\frac{C\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{Cd \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma) \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n}}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Bounding $\mu \geqslant \lambda_{d+1}$ in Theorem 4.1 and $\mu \leqslant \lambda_d$ in Theorem 4.2, only summands with $\lambda_j > \lambda_{d+1}$ and $\lambda_k < \lambda_d$, respectively, appear. Neglecting the minimum with 1 in each summand, the local bound follows.

For the global bound use the inequality $\min(x, 1) \leqslant \sqrt{x}$ for $x \geqslant 0$ to obtain from Theorem 4.1 with $\mu \geqslant \lambda_{d+1}$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}] \leqslant \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sqrt{\frac{C\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n}}.$$

Considering $\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}$, the value l in Theorem 4.2 has to be chosen carefully. For $a > 0$ let $d < l = l(a) \leqslant p+1$ be the index such that $\lambda_d - \lambda_k \geqslant a$ for $k \geqslant l$ and $\lambda_d - \lambda_k < a$ for $d < k < l$. Then the first inequality of Theorem 4.2 with $\mu \leqslant \lambda_d$ implies the upper bound

$$\sum_{k>d} \frac{C\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{na} + da + \lambda_d e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}.$$

Minimizing over $a > 0$ and incorporating the remainder in the summand for $j = d$ gives the global bound in (4.1). □

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the global bound (4.1) is an improvement over Proposition 2.3. It is, however, in general slightly weaker than Proposition 2.5.

Finally, we state an upper bound for the Hilbert-Schmidt distance $\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2$, which corresponds to Theorems 4.1 and 4.2.

4.4. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1. For all $r = 0, \dots d$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant 2C \sum_{j \leqslant r} \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2\min(d-r, p-d).$$

Moreover, if $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$, then for all $l = d+1, \dots p+1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant 2C \sum_{k \geqslant l} \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + 2\min(l-d-1, d) + e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}.$$

In both inequalities the constant C is the same as in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. In particular, if $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant 4C \frac{\operatorname{tr}_{\leqslant d}(\Sigma) \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}. \tag{4.2}$$

The proof of Theorem 4.4 is given in Appendix E.

4.2. **A refined non-asymptotic bound.** In the previous section, we stated a bound which did not make use of the full strength of Propositions 3.4 and 3.6. By combining (3.4), Lemma 3.8, and Corollary 3.12, we obtain a more powerful result at the cost of higher complexity. The details are given in Appendix F.

4.5. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and let $\mu \in [\lambda_d, \lambda_{d+1}]$. Then for all indices $r_0 = 1, \dots, d$ such that*

$$\frac{\lambda_{r_0}}{\lambda_{r_0} - \mu} \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \mu} \leqslant n/(256C_3^2) \tag{4.3}$$

and all $r = 0, \dots, r_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant r} (\lambda_j - \mu) \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2 \sum_{r < j \leqslant d} (\lambda_j - \mu) + R$$

(one can take e.g. $C = 16C_2 + 8C_3^2$). The remainder term is given by

$$R = C\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j - \mu)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}\exp\Big(-\frac{n(\lambda_{r_0}-\mu)^2}{256C_3^2\lambda_{r_0}^2}\Big).$$

Compared to Theorem 4.1, we have replaced the full trace of Σ by the partial trace $\operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)$, which in the case $r_0 = d$ coincides with the oracle reconstruction error of $P_{\leqslant d}$. To achieve this, we have to add an additional eigenvalue condition (on the part that disappeared). The strength of this result is shown in the examples in Section 4.4. Similarly, we have:

4.6. **Theorem.** *Grant Assumption 2.1, let $\mu \in [\lambda_d, \lambda_{d+1}]$ and suppose $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$. Then for all indices $l_0 > d$ such that*

$$\frac{\mu}{\mu - \lambda_{l_0}}\sum_{k\geqslant l_0}\frac{\lambda_k}{\mu - \lambda_k} \leqslant n/(256C_3^2) \tag{4.4}$$

and all $l = l_0, \dots, p+1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}] \leqslant C\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu - \lambda_k)\frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}_{<l_0}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + 2\sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1}(\mu - \lambda_k) + R$$

(one can take e.g. $C = 16C_2 + 8C_3^2$). The remainder term is given by

$$R = C\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu - \lambda_k)\frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2}\exp\Big(-\frac{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_{l_0})^2}{16C_3^2\lambda_d^2}\Big) + 2(\mu - \lambda_p)e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}.$$

Theorem 4.6 follows from (3.11), Lemma 3.9, Corollary 3.14, and Theorem 3.13. The details are as in the proof of Theorems 4.2 and 4.5 and are therefore omitted. Summing the two inequalities in Theorems 4.5 and 4.6, an upper bound for the expected excess risk follows. As in the previous section, simple global bounds can be derived from Theorems 4.5 and 4.6.

4.7. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and suppose $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$. Let $r_0 \leqslant d$ and $l_0 > d$ be such that $\lambda_{r_0} > \lambda_{r_0+1} = \dots = \lambda_{d+1}$ and $\lambda_d = \dots = \lambda_{l_0-1} > \lambda_{l_0}$. Suppose that Conditions (4.3) and (4.4) hold with $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$ and $\mu = \lambda_d$, respectively. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C\sum_{j\leqslant r_0}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)}{n}} + C\sqrt{\frac{d\operatorname{tr}_{<l_0}(\Sigma)\operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant l_0}(\Sigma)}{n}} + R,$$

where R denotes the sum of the remainder terms from Theorems 4.5 and 4.6.

In order to compare Corollary 4.7 to Proposition 2.5, suppose that we have polynomial decay of eigenvalues, i.e. (4.12) holds. Then we will see in Section 4.4 that Condition (3.22) holds, provided that $d^2 \log d \leqslant cn$, and in this case Corollary 4.7 gives $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C\sqrt{d^{2-\alpha}/n}$. In comparison, Proposition 2.5 yields $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C\sqrt{1/n}$. Hence, Corollary 4.7 gives an improvement over Proposition 2.5 if $\alpha > 2$.

This example also illustrates that Corollary 4.7 is an asymptotic statement in the sense that n has to be large enough such that Conditions (4.3) and (4.4) are satisfied. Note, however, that a similar bound can be proven if we let $r_0 \leqslant d$ (resp. $l_0 > d$) be the largest (resp. smallest) index such that Condition (4.3) (resp. (4.4)) holds.

Proof. By Theorem 4.5 and the properties of r_0, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \min\left(\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})}, \lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1} \right) + R_1.$$

Using the inequality $\min(a/x, x) \leqslant \sqrt{a}$ for $x, a \geqslant 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant r_0} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)}{n}} + R_1.$$

For $a > 0$ the index $d < l = l(a) < p+1$ such that $\lambda_d - \lambda_k \geqslant a$ for $k \geqslant l$ and $\lambda_d - \lambda_k < a$ for $d < k < l$ satisfies $l \geqslant l_0$, since $\lambda_{l_0 - 1} = \lambda_d$. Thus Theorem 4.6 implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}(\lambda_d)] \leqslant C \frac{\operatorname{tr}_{<l_0}(\Sigma) \operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant l_0}(\Sigma)}{na} + 2da + R_2.$$

Minimizing over $a > 0$, gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}(\lambda_d)] \leqslant C \sqrt{\frac{d \operatorname{tr}_{<l_0}(\Sigma) \operatorname{tr}_{\geqslant l_0}(\Sigma)}{n}} + R_2,$$

Combining these bounds with $\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_d \leqslant \mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1}) + \mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}(\lambda_d)$, the claim follows. □

4.3. **Linear expansions.** The underlying idea of our analysis of the excess risk in the previous sections was that we cannot use linearisation of $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ (resp. $\hat{P}_{>d}$) as in (2.6), since it might be the case that $\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}$ is very small or even zero. In this complementary section, we show that linear expansions of $\hat{P}_{>d}$ and $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$ may lead to tighter bounds for the excess risk as well as for the Hilbert-Schmidt distance if stronger eigenvalue conditions are satisfied (including $\lambda_d > \lambda_{d+1}$). In particular, these bounds lead up to a constant to the exact leading terms which appeared in the asymptotic result in (2.5) and Proposition 2.2. Note that it is possible to derive higher order expansions by similar, but more tedious considerations.

Identity (3.1) can be seen as a building block to derive expansions for empirical spectral projectors. Indeed, using the identity (L.5), we get

$$\hat{P}_{>d} = P_{>d} + P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{>d} - P_{>d}\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} = P_{>d} + \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{k > d} \left(\frac{P_j \Delta \hat{P}_k}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_k} + \frac{P_k \Delta \hat{P}_j}{\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k} \right)$$

and a similar formula for $\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}$, which are the basis in the proof of Lemma 3.3. The following lemma immediately leads to a linear expansion.

4.8. **Lemma.** *For $j \leqslant d$ we have*

$$P_j\hat{P}_{>d} = \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} + \sum_{k\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_l)(\lambda_k-\hat{\lambda}_l)} + \sum_{k>d}\sum_{l\leqslant d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)(\hat{\lambda}_l-\lambda_k)} - \sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}$$

and for $k > d$ we have

$$P_k\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{P_k\Delta P_j}{\lambda_k-\lambda_j} + \sum_{j>d}\sum_{l\leqslant d}\frac{P_k\Delta P_j\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_k-\hat{\lambda}_l)(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_l)} + \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_k\Delta P_j\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)(\hat{\lambda}_l-\lambda_j)} - \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{l\leqslant d}\frac{P_k\Delta P_j\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)(\lambda_k-\hat{\lambda}_l)}.$$

Both identities hold provided that all denominators are non-zero.

A proof of Lemma 4.8 can be found in Appendix G. Note that compared to

$$P_j\hat{P}_{>d} = \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta\hat{P}_k}{\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_k}, \tag{4.5}$$

where only spectral gaps between j and $k > d$ appear, the first formula in Lemma 4.8 includes all spectral gaps between $k > d$ and $l \leqslant d$.

Proceeding as in Section 3.2, we get the following deterministic upper bound for the excess risk. A proof is given in Appendix H.

4.9. **Theorem.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant 32\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{\|P_j\Delta P_k\|_2^2}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} + 128\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{1}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\left\|\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta P_{>d}}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\right\|_2^2 + 128\sum_{k>d}\frac{1}{\lambda_d-\lambda_k}\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{P_k\Delta P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\right\|_2^2 + R_1 + R_2,$$

where the remainder terms R_1 and R_2 are given in (H.4) *and* (H.5) *in Appendix H, respectively.*

Similarly, we have the following result for the Hilbert-Schmidt distance. A proof can be found in Appendix I.

4.10. **Theorem.** *On the event $\{\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} \leqslant (\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1})/2\}$ we have*

$$\|P_{\leqslant d}-\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant 4\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{\|P_j\Delta P_k\|^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2} + 32\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty^2\frac{\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1})}{\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1}}$$

$$+ 64\left\| \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta P_{>d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)} \right\|_2^2$$
$$+ 64\left\| \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta S_{\leqslant d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)} \right\|_\infty^2 \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1}),$$

where $S_{\leqslant d} = S_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})$ *is defined in* (3.3).

4.11. **Remark.** The bound can be interpreted as a second order version of

$$\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant 2\frac{\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1})}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}.$$

which has been discussed in Remark 3.2.

Similarly as in Section 4.2, we can take expectation in Theorems 4.9 and 4.10. Since this leads to lengthy remainder terms, we only state the explicit result which follows from Theorem 4.10.

4.12. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and suppose*

$$\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1}}\left(\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}} + \sum_{k>d}\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_d-\lambda_k}\right) \leqslant n/(256C_3^2). \tag{4.6}$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant 4C_2 \sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{\lambda_j\lambda_k}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2} + R_1 + R_2,$$

where R_1 *is a second-order remainder term given by*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 = {} & C\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n^2(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\left(\sum_{k>d}\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\right)^2 \\ & + C\frac{\lambda_d \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n^2(\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\left(\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\right)^2 \\ & + C\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n^3(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\left(\sum_{l>d}\frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_j-\lambda_l}\right)^2\left(\sum_{m\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_m-\lambda_{d+1}}\right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and R_2 *is a remainder term given by*

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 = {} & \exp\left(-\frac{n(\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1})^2}{256C_3^2\lambda_d^2}\right) \\ & \cdot\left(2d + C\frac{\lambda_d \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n^2(\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\left(\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\right)^2\right. \\ & \left. + C\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n^3(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\left(\sum_{l>d}\frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_j-\lambda_l}\right)^2\left(\sum_{m\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_m-\lambda_{d+1}}\right)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.12 follows from taking expectation in Theorem 4.10. Note that the second and the last term are bounded by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that bounds of the same order as presented in Theorem 4.5 can be derived for the L^2-norm of $\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}$ (see also the comment after Theorem 4.1). Moreover, by [17, Corollary 2] and the fact that (4.6) is satisfied, we have

$$\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty^4\right]\right)^{1/2} \leqslant C\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_d-\lambda_{d+1}}\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\lambda_j}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})}.$$

4.4. **Applications.** In this section, we illustrate our different upper bounds for the excess risk in several examples. We consider three main classes of eigenvalue behaviour: a spiked covariance model, exponential decay of eigenvalues, and polynomial decay of eigenvalues. One interesting conclusion is that in these typical situations the expected excess risk is at least as small as the oracle risk, uniformly over $d \leqslant cn$ for some small constant $c > 0$.

4.13. **Example** (Spiked covariance model)**.** As a first simple example, let Θ be the class of all symmetric matrices whose eigenvalues satisfy $\sigma^2+\kappa x \geqslant \lambda_1 \geqslant \ldots \geqslant \lambda_d \geqslant \sigma^2 + x$ and $\lambda_{d+1} = \ldots = \lambda_p = \sigma^2$, where $\sigma^2 > 0$, $x \geqslant 0$ and $\kappa > 1$ (see e.g. Cai, Ma, and Wu [10]). Then we have

$$\sup_{\Sigma\in\Theta}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant \min\left(C\kappa\frac{d(\sigma^2+\kappa x)(p-d)\sigma^2}{nx}, d\kappa x, (p-d)\kappa x\right) + \kappa x e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}, \tag{4.7}$$

provided that $d \leqslant cn$, where $c, C > 0$ are constants depending only on C_1. Considering separately the cases $x \leqslant c\sigma^2$ and $x > c\sigma^2$, we see that the excess risk is always smaller than the oracle risk $R(P_{\leqslant d}) = \sigma^2(p-d)$. To prove (4.7), it suffices to apply the first non-asymptotic bound in Section 4.1. Indeed, the claim follows from applying either Lemma 3.1 with $\mu = \sigma^2$ and Theorem 4.1 or Lemma 3.1 with $\mu = \sigma^2 + \kappa x$ and Theorem 4.2 (depending on whether $(\sigma^2+\kappa x)d \leqslant \sigma^2(p-d)$ or $(\sigma^2+\kappa x)d > \sigma^2(p-d)$). In fact, since

$$x\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant 2\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \kappa x\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2,$$

(4.7) is equivalent to [10, Theorem 9], cf. also their corresponding lower bound stated in (2.8) above.

4.14. **Example** (Exponential decay of eigenvalues)**.** As a generalisation of the spiked covariance model and as a preparation for the case of an exponential decay of eigenvalues, let us suppose that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$c(\lambda_d - \lambda_k) \leqslant \lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1} \text{ for all } k > d. \tag{4.8}$$

Then, by Lemma 3.1 with $\mu = \lambda_p$ (resp. $\mu = 0$ if $p = \infty$), we get

$$\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\mu)\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle \leqslant \frac{1}{c}\sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle.$$

Hence, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5 (applied with $r_0 = d$ and $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$) yield:

4.15. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and Condition* (4.8). *Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant d} \min\left(\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})}, \lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1} \right).$$

Moreover, if

$$\frac{\lambda_d}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}} \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})} \leqslant 1/(256 C_3^2), \tag{4.9}$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant d} \min\left(\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})}, \lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1} \right) + R, \tag{4.10}$$

where R is the remainder in Theorem 4.5 with $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$ and $r = r_0 = d$. In both bounds $C > 1$ is a constant depending only on c and C_1.

We now apply this result in the case of exponential decay of eigenvalues, i.e.

$$\lambda_j = e^{-\alpha j}, \quad j \geqslant 1, \tag{4.11}$$

where $\alpha > 0$. Then Condition (4.9) is satisfied with $c = 1 - e^{-\alpha}$ and the first bound in Corollary 4.15 implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant d} \min\left(1/n, e^{-\alpha j}\right) \leqslant C(d \wedge \log n)/n,$$

where C (not the same at each occurrence) is a constant depending only on C_1 and α. This bound already improves the relative bound in [8, Theorem 3.4].

Next, we show that this result can be much improved by applying the second bound in Corollary 4.15. Indeed, the left-hand side of Condition (4.9) can be bounded by $d(1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-2}$. Thus, provided this value is smaller than $n/(256 C_3^2)$, we can apply (4.10). The main term on the right-hand side of (4.10) is bounded by

$$C(1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-2} \frac{d e^{-\alpha(d+1)}}{n}.$$

and the remainder term by $C(1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-2} n^{-1} \exp(-n(1 - e^{-\alpha})^2/(256 C_3^2))$. We have shown:

4.16. **Corollary.** *Grant Assumption 2.1 and Condition* (4.11). *Then there are constants $c, C > 0$ (depending only on C_1 and α) such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C \frac{d e^{-\alpha d}}{n},$$

provided that $d \leqslant cn$.

Noting for the population reconstruction error

$$R(P_{\leqslant d}) = \sum_{k>d} e^{-\alpha k} = e^{-\alpha}(1-e^{-\alpha})^{-1}e^{-\alpha d},$$

we see that the excess risk is smaller than the oracle risk, provided that $d \leqslant cn$.

Similarly, we can show by Corollary 4.12 under (4.11) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant C\frac{1}{n} + C\frac{d^2}{n} + Ce^{-n/C},$$

provided that $d \leqslant cn$, where $c, C > 0$ are constants depending only on C_1 and α. This result can be compared to the non-asymptotic results by Mas and Ruymgaart [25] and Koltchinskii and Lounici [18], who used perturbation theory for linear operators. [25, Theorem 5] says that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|(P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d})u\|^2] \leqslant C\frac{d^2\log^2 n}{n}$$

for all $d \geqslant 2$, $n \geqslant 2$, and certain unit vectors u. Moreover, applying (2.6), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{P}_{\leqslant d} - P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant C\frac{1}{n} + C\frac{de^{5\alpha d}}{n^2}.$$

For the remainder term to be small, this requires n^2 to be much larger than $e^{5\alpha d}$, which our analysis avoids.

4.17. **Example** (Polynomial decay)**.** Consider the case of polynomial decay of eigenvalues, i.e.

$$\lambda_j = j^{-\alpha}, \quad j \geqslant 1, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\alpha > 1$. First, the local bound in Corollary 4.3 and [14, Equation (10)] yield

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C\frac{d\log d}{n}$$

for all $2 \leqslant d \leqslant cn$. In addition, using Theorem 4.1, we also get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1})\right] &\leqslant C\sum_{j\leqslant d/2}\frac{\lambda_j}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})} + \sum_{d/2<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}) \\ &\leqslant C\frac{d}{n} + Cd^{1-\alpha} \leqslant Cn^{1/\alpha-1} + Cd^{1-\alpha},\end{aligned}$$

where C (not the same at each occurrence) is a constant depending only on C_1 and α. Since we also have $\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}(\lambda_d) \leqslant d\lambda_d = d^{1-\alpha}$, we get the following consequence of the first non-asymptotic upper bound in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA}] \leqslant C\min\left(\frac{d\log d}{n}, n^{1/\alpha-1} + d^{1-\alpha}\right).$$

Again, for large d, this result can be much improved by using the refined non-asymptotic bound in Section 4.2. Choosing $r_0 = \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$, then there is

a constant c depending only on C_1 and α such that Condition (4.3) with $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$ is satisfied if $d \leqslant cn$ and Theorem 4.5 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})] &\leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant \lfloor d/2 \rfloor} \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})} + 2 \sum_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor < j \leqslant d} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}) + R \\ &\leqslant C\frac{d^{2-\alpha}}{n} + Cd^{1-\alpha} + C\frac{de^{-n/C}}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with $\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d}(\lambda_d) \leqslant d^{1-\alpha}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{d}] \leqslant C\frac{d^{2-\alpha}}{n} + Cd^{1-\alpha} + C\frac{de^{-n/C}}{n}, \tag{4.13}$$

provided that $d \leqslant cn$. Noting for the population reconstruction error

$$R(P_{\leqslant d}) = \sum_{k>d} k^{-\alpha} \geqslant cd^{1-\alpha},$$

we see from (4.13) that for $d \leqslant cn$ the excess risk is always smaller than a constant times the oracle risk.

On the other hand, from [14, Equation (10)] follows that there is a constant c depending only on C_1 and α such that Condition (4.3) with $\mu = \lambda_{d+1}$ and $r_0 = d$ is satisfied if $d^2 \log d \leqslant cn$. In this case, Theorem 4.5 implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})] \leqslant C \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>d}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})} + R \leqslant C\frac{d^{2-\alpha}\log d}{n} + C\frac{d\log d}{n} e^{-\frac{n}{Cd^2}}.$$

For the second part of the excess risk, Theorem 4.6 yields no improvement over Theorem 4.2, since both quantities $\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)$ and $\operatorname{tr}_{<l_0}(\Sigma)$ differ only by a constant. One can, however, apply the linear expansion in Theorem 4.9 which gives (after some computation)

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{d}] \leqslant C\frac{d^{2-\alpha}}{n} + C\frac{d^3 \log^3 d}{n^2},$$

provided that $d^2 \log d \leqslant cn$. We see that the excess risk is of much smaller order than the oracle risk, as long as the remainder term is negligible.

For the Hilbert-Schmidt distance, Corollary 4.12 gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2] \leqslant C\frac{d^2 \log d}{n} + C\frac{d^5 \log^2 d}{n^2} + C\frac{d^7 \log^4 d}{n^3} + Ce^{-\frac{n}{Cd^2}},$$

provided that $d^2 \log d \leqslant cn$, where $c, C > 0$ are constants depending only on C_1 and α. Compared to [25, Theorem 5], where the order $(d^2 \log^2 n \log^2 d)/n$ is derived, this bound improves upon the $\log^2 n$-factor, but involves a remainder which might be harmful for d^3/n large, but d^2/n small. For this case higher order than linear expansions can extend the domain where the bound $(d^2 \log d)/n$ holds. Our aim being to provide very general bounds and methodology, this derivation is not pursued here.

Appendix A. Proof of Proposition 3.6

Using $\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant 1$ from (L.2) and

$$\sum_{d<k<l} \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant d,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{>d} &= \sum_{k>d}(\mu-\lambda_k)\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \\ &\leqslant \sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu-\lambda_k)\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle + \sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1}(\mu-\lambda_k). \qquad \text{(A.1)}\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 3.4, on the event

$$\{\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d \geqslant -(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\} = \{\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_k \geqslant (\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\},$$

we have

$$\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant 4\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}. \qquad \text{(A.2)}$$

Using (L.2), we get

$$\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant 4\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2} + \mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\big). \qquad \text{(A.3)}$$

For $k \geqslant l$ such that $\lambda_k < \lambda_d/2$, we have

$$\{\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2\} \subseteq \{\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -\lambda_d/4\}.$$

Hence, by (A.2) and the bound

$$\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k<\lambda_d/2}} (\mu-\lambda_k)\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \leqslant d(\mu-\lambda_p),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k<\lambda_d/2}} (\mu-\lambda_k)\langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \\ &\leqslant 4\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k<\lambda_d/2}} (\mu-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2} + d(\mu-\lambda_p)\mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -\lambda_d/4\big). \qquad \text{(A.4)}\end{aligned}$$

Inserting (A.3) (for $k \geqslant l$ such that $\lambda_k \geqslant \lambda_d/2$) and (A.4) into (A.1), (3.9) follows. It remains to prove the second claim, where we use the same recursion argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.4. First, we introduce the operator

$$R_{\geqslant l_0} = R_{\geqslant l_0}(\mu) = \sum_{k\geqslant l_0}\sqrt{\mu-\lambda_k}P_k,$$

which fulfills the identities

$$S_{\geqslant l_0} R_{\geqslant l_0} = P_{\geqslant l_0}$$

and

$$\sum_{k \geqslant l_0} (\mu - \lambda_k) \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle = \| R_{\geqslant l_0} \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 4.1 we derive

$$\sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \leqslant 2 \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta P_{<l_0} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + 2 \| S_{\geqslant l} \Delta P_{\geqslant l_0} \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2$$

Moreover, on the event $\{\| S_{\geqslant l_0} \Delta S_{\geqslant l_0} \|_\infty \leqslant 1/16\}$, the last term can be bounded by $\| R_{\geqslant l_0} \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2 / 8$. Hence, on the event $\{\| S_{\geqslant l_0} \Delta S_{\geqslant l_0} \|_\infty \leqslant 1/16\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \\
&\leqslant 2 \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta P_{\leqslant l_0} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + (1/8) \sum_{k \geqslant l_0} (\mu - \lambda_k) \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Using also that $\| P_k \Delta \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2 \leqslant \| P_k \Delta \|_2^2$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&4 \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \\
&\leqslant 8 \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta P_{\leqslant l_0} \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA} \\
&+ 4 \sum_{k \geqslant l} (\mu - \lambda_k) \frac{\| P_k \Delta \|_2^2}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \mathbb{1}\big(\| S_{\geqslant l_0} \Delta S_{\geqslant l_0} \|_\infty > 1/16 \big).
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (3.9), we obtain the second claim. □

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 3.13

First, we apply the max-min characterisation (K.2) of eigenvalues and obtain $\hat{\lambda}_d \geqslant \lambda_d(P_{\leqslant d} \hat{\Sigma} P_{\leqslant d})$. This gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -x) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\lambda_d(P_{\leqslant d} \hat{\Sigma} P_{\leqslant d}) - \lambda_d(P_{\leqslant d} \Sigma P_{\leqslant d}) < -x). \tag{B.1}$$

Similar to Lemma 3.11, we have for self-adjoint, positive operators S, T on $V_d = \operatorname{span}(u_1, \dots, u_d)$ and $y < \lambda_d(S)$

$$\lambda_1\big((S-y)^{-1/2} (S-T) (S-y)^{-1/2} \big) \leqslant 1$$

if and only if (for the operator partial ordering)

$$(S-y)^{-1/2} (T-y) (S-y)^{-1/2} = I - (S-y)^{-1/2} (S-T) (S-y)^{-1/2} \geqslant 0.$$

This is the case if and only if $T - y \geqslant 0$, that is $\lambda_d(T) \geqslant y$.

Applying the negation of this equivalence to $S = P_{\leqslant d}\Sigma P_{\leqslant d}$, $T = P_{\leqslant d}\hat{\Sigma}P_{\leqslant d}$, and $y = \lambda_d(S) - x = \lambda_d - x$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_d(P_{\leqslant d}\hat{\Sigma}P_{\leqslant d}) - \lambda_d(P_{\leqslant d}\Sigma P_{\leqslant d}) < -x) \leqslant \mathbb{P}(\|T_{\leqslant d}\Delta T_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty > 1) \tag{B.2}$$

with

$$T_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_j - \lambda_d + x}} P_j.$$

We consider $X' = T_{\leqslant d}X$, satisfying Assumption 2.1 with the same constant C_1, and obtain the covariance operator

$$\Sigma' = T_{\leqslant d}\Sigma T_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_d + x} P_j.$$

Hence, noting that $\lambda \mapsto \lambda/(\lambda - \lambda_d + x)$ is decreasing for $\lambda \geqslant \lambda_d$, we choose

$$x' = \frac{1}{C_3\lambda_1'} = \frac{x}{C_3\lambda_d}.$$

Then (3.12), applied to $\Delta' = T_{\leqslant d}\Delta T_{\leqslant d}$ and x', gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T_{\leqslant d}\Delta T_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty > 1) \leqslant \exp\left(- n \min\left(\frac{x^2}{C_3^2\lambda_d^2}, \frac{x}{C_3\lambda_d} \right)\right) \tag{B.3}$$

in view of Condition (3.19). We conclude by (B.1)-(B.3). □

Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 4.1

Taking expectation in (3.2) and plugging in the bound $n\mathbb{E}[\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2] \leqslant n\mathbb{E}[\|P_j\Delta\|_2^2] \leqslant 2C_2\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}\Sigma$ (with C_2 from (2.4)), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}\right] \leqslant 8C_2 \sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j - \mu)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + \sum_{r<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j - \mu) \\ + \sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j - \mu)\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})/2).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, noting the monotonicity of $\lambda \mapsto \lambda/(\lambda - \lambda_{d+1})$ for $\lambda < \lambda_{d+1}$ and optimising over r, the claim follows from the following lemma.

C.1. **Lemma.** *Let $j \leqslant d$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&8C_2\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + \mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})/2) \\ &\leqslant (8C_2 + 4C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. If

$$\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \leqslant 1/(4C_3^3), \tag{C.1}$$

then Condition (3.17) is satisfied and we can apply (3.18). Thus, in this case, the left-hand side can be bounded by

$$8C_2\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}+\exp\bigg(-\frac{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}{4C_3^2\lambda_j^2}\bigg).$$

Using the inequality $x\exp(-x)\leqslant 1/e\leqslant 1/2$, $x\geqslant 0$, this is bounded by

$$(8C_2+2C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}.$$

On the other hand, if (C.1) is not satisfied, then the left-hand side can be bounded by

$$8C_2\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}+1\leqslant(8C_2+4C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}.$$

Hence, we get the claim in both cases. □

Appendix D. Proof of Theorem 4.2

Taking expectation in (3.9) and plugging in the bound $n\mathbb{E}[\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2]\leqslant n\mathbb{E}[\|P_k\Delta\|_2^2]\leqslant 2C_2\lambda_k\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}\right]&\leqslant 8C_2\sum_{k\geqslant l}(\mu-\lambda_k)\frac{\lambda_k\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}+\sum_{k=(d+1)\vee(l-d)}^{l-1}(\mu-\lambda_k)\\&\quad+\sum_{\substack{k\geqslant l:\\ \lambda_k\geqslant\lambda_d/2}}(\mu-\lambda_k)\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d-\lambda_d<-(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2)\\&\quad+d(\mu-\lambda_p)\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d-\lambda_d<-\lambda_d/4).\end{aligned}$$

Consider the last term. Since $d\leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$, the conditions of Theorem 3.13 are satisfied with $x=\lambda_d/4$ and we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d-\lambda_d<-\lambda_d/4)\leqslant e^{-\frac{n}{16C_3^2}}.$$

Using this and the bounds $x\exp(-x)\leqslant(2/e)\exp(-x/2)\leqslant\exp(-x/2)$, $x\geqslant 0$, and $d\leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$, we see that

$$d\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d-\lambda_d<-\lambda_d/4)\leqslant de^{-\frac{n}{16C_3^2}}\leqslant e^{-\frac{n}{32C_3^2}}.$$

This gives the desired bound for the last term. Now, the first inequality of the theorem follows from the lemma below. This implies the second inequality because bound becomes larger when the second sum is taken from $k=d+1$ to $l-1$ and then l is easily optimised.

D.1. **Lemma.** *Let $k>d$ be such that $\lambda_k\geqslant\lambda_d/2$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&8C_2\frac{\lambda_k\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}+\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_d-\lambda_d<-(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)/2)\\&\leqslant(8C_2+8C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_k\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d-\lambda_k)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma D.1. If

$$\frac{\lambda_d \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \leqslant 1/(4C_3^2), \tag{D.1}$$

then Condition (3.20) is satisfied and we can apply (3.21). Thus, in this case, the left-hand side can be bounded by

$$8C_2 \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + \exp\bigg(- \frac{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2}{4C_3^2 \lambda_d^2} \bigg).$$

Using the inequality $x \exp(-x) \leqslant 1/e \leqslant 1/2$, $x \geqslant 0$, this is bounded by

$$8C_2 \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + \frac{2C_3^2 \lambda_d^2}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} \leqslant (8C_2 + 4C_3^2) \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2},$$

where we applied the bound $\lambda_d/2 \leqslant \lambda_k$ in the second inequality. On the other hand, if (D.1) is not satisfied, then the left-hand side can be bounded by

$$8C_2 \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2} + 1 \leqslant (8C_2 + 8C_3^2) \frac{\lambda_k \operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^2},$$

where we again applied the bound $\lambda_d/2 \leqslant \lambda_k$. Hence, we get the claim in both cases. □

Appendix E. Proof of Theorem 4.4

We have

$$\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 = 2\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = 2\langle P_{>d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle.$$

Applying (3.7), Lemma C.1, and the bound

$$\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle \leqslant \langle P_{\leqslant r}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle + \min(d - r, p - d),$$

we get the first claim. Applying the arguments in the proof of Proposition 3.6 and Theorem 4.2 and the bound

$$\langle P_{>d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle \leqslant \langle P_{\geqslant l}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \rangle + \min(l - d - 1, d),$$

we get the second claim, provided that $d \leqslant n/(16C_3^2)$ holds. □

Appendix F. Proof of Theorem 4.5

Theorem 4.5 follows from taking expectation of the inequality in (3.4). We begin with two preliminary lemmas. Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma C.1, we have:

F.1. **Lemma.** *Let $j \leqslant r_0 \leqslant d$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &16C_2 \frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0} \lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2\mathbb{P}(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})/2) \\ &\leqslant (16C_2 + 8C_3^2) \frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0} \lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{F.1}$$

Proof. If

$$\frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0}\lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} \leqslant 1/(4C_3^2), \tag{F.2}$$

then the Condition (3.17) is satisfied and the left-hand side of (F.1) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&16C_2\frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0}\lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2\exp\bigg(-n\min\bigg(\frac{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}{4C_3^2\lambda_{d+1}^2}, \frac{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}{2C_3\lambda_{d+1}}\bigg)\bigg)\\ &\leqslant (16C_2+8C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0}\lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the bounds $x\exp(-x)\leqslant 1/e\leqslant 1/2$ and $x^2\exp(-x)\leqslant 4/e^2\leqslant 1$. On the other hand, if (F.2) is not satisfied, then (F.1) can be bounded by

$$16C_2\frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0}\lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2 \leqslant (16C_2+8C_3^2)\frac{\lambda_j(\sum_{k>r_0}\lambda_k)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Since we will apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the remainder term, we will also need the following bound on the L^2-norm.

F.2. **Lemma.** *For all $r\leqslant d$, we have*

$$\bigg(\mathbb{E}\bigg[\bigg(\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\bigg)^2\bigg]\bigg)^{1/2} \leqslant C\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\lambda_j\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}.$$

Proof. By the Minkovski inequality, the left-hand side is bounded by

$$\sum_{j\leqslant r}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\bigg[(\lambda_j-\mu)^2\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^4}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^4}\bigg]\bigg)^{1/2}. \tag{F.3}$$

By Assumption 2.1, there is a constant C depending only on C_1 such that

$$\big(\mathbb{E}\big[\|P_j\Delta P_k\|_2^4\big]\big)^{1/2} \leqslant C\frac{\lambda_j\lambda_k}{n}.$$

Thus, by the Minkovski inequality,

$$\big(\mathbb{E}\big[\|P_j\Delta\|_2^4\big]\big)^{1/2} \leqslant C\frac{\lambda_j\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n}.$$

Plugging this into (F.3), we get

$$\sum_{j\leqslant r}\bigg(\mathbb{E}\bigg[(\lambda_j-\mu)^2\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^4}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\bigg]\bigg)^{1/2} \leqslant C\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j-\mu)\frac{\lambda_j\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2},$$

and the claim follows. □

Now let us finish the proof of Theorem 4.5. Taking expectation of the inequality in (3.4) and using Lemma F.1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}\right] \leqslant (16C_2 + 8C_3^2)\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j - \mu)\frac{\lambda_j \operatorname{tr}_{>r_0}(\Sigma)}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} + 2\sum_{r<j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j - \mu)$$
$$+ 8\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j\leqslant r}(\lambda_j - \mu)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}\mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{\leqslant r_0}\Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\big)\right].$$

If Condition (4.3) holds, then Corollary 3.8 gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|S_{\leqslant r_0}\Delta S_{\leqslant r_0}\|_\infty > 1/16\right) \leqslant \exp\left(-\frac{n(\lambda_{r_0} - \mu)^2}{256C_3^2\lambda_{r_0}^2}\right). \tag{F.4}$$

Thus the claim follows from applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma F.2, and (F.4) to the remainder term. □

Appendix G. Proof of Lemma 4.8

We only prove the first identity, since the second one follows by the same line of arguments. First using (4.5) and the identities $I = P_{\leqslant d} + P_{>d} = \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} + \hat{P}_{>d}$, we get

$$P_j\hat{P}_{>d} = \sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} = \sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} + \sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{>d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l}$$

and

$$\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} = \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} + \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{>d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k}.$$

Thus

$$P_j\hat{P}_{>d} = \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} + \sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} - \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k}$$
$$+ \left(\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{>d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} - \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{>d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k}\right). \tag{G.1}$$

Using (3.1), we get

$$\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} = \sum_{k\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l)(\lambda_k - \hat{\lambda}_l)}$$

and

$$-\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} = \sum_{k>d}\sum_{l\leqslant d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)(\hat{\lambda}_l - \lambda_k)}.$$

Moreover, again using (3.1), the term in brackets in (G.1) is equal to

$$\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{>d}\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} - \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat{P}_{>d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d} \frac{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)-(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)}{(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)} P_j\Delta P_k\hat P_l \\
&= -\sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d} \frac{\lambda_k-\hat\lambda_l}{(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)} P_j\Delta P_k\hat P_l \\
&= -\sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)} P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat P_l,
\end{aligned}
$$

and the claim follows. □

Appendix H. Proof of Theorem 4.9

We first prove an upper bound for $\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d} = \mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})$. By (3.8), we have

$$
\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d} = \sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\|P_j\hat P_{>d}\|_2^2 = \|R_{\leqslant d}\hat P_{>d}\|_2^2. \tag{H.1}
$$

In the proof of Lemma 4.8 we have also shown that

$$
P_j\hat P_{>d} = \sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat P_{>d}}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} + \sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat P_l}{\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l} - \sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat P_l}{(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}. \tag{H.2}
$$

Inserting this into the second term in (H.1) and applying the triangle inequality twice, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d} \leqslant\ & 4\sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\Big\|\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\hat P_{>d}}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\Big\|_2^2 \\
&+ 2\sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\Big\|\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat P_l}{\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l}\Big\|_2^2 \\
&+ 4\sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\Big\|\sum_{k>d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat P_l}{(\lambda_j-\hat\lambda_l)(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\Big\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{PCA}_{\leqslant d} \leqslant\ & 4\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2}\|P_j\Delta P_k\|_2^2 \\
&+ 8\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\|P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat P_l\|_2^2 \\
&+ 16\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^2}\Big\|\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat P_l}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\Big\|_2^2 \\
&+ \sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\mathbb{1}\big(\hat\lambda_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1}>(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{H.3}
$$

Using the operator $S_{\leqslant d} = S_{\leqslant d}(\lambda_{d+1})$ from (3.3), the second term on the right-hand side of (H.3) is equal to

$$8\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2 = 8\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}R_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2$$

which can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\|R_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2/2 + 8\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2\mathbb{1}(\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty > 1/16)\\ &= \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}/2 + 8\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2\mathbb{1}(\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty > 1/16).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the third term on the right-hand side of (H.3) is bounded via

$$\begin{aligned}&16\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{l>d}\frac{1}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\left\|\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\right\|_2^2\\ &= 16\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta\hat{P}_{>d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^{1/2}(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\right\|_2^2\\ &\leqslant 32\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta P_{>d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^{1/2}(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\right\|_2^2\\ &+ 32\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta S_{\leqslant d}R_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{>d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^{1/2}(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\right\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

and the last term can be bounded by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}/4 + 32\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta P_{\leqslant d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^{1/2}(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\right\|_2^2\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1}$$

with

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \left\{\left\|\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta S_{\leqslant d}}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})^{1/2}(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)}\right\|_\infty^2 > 1/128\right\}.$$

Inserting these bounds into (H.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}\\ &\leqslant 16\sum_{j\leqslant d}\sum_{k>d}\frac{\|P_j\Delta P_k\|_2^2}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} + 128\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{1}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\left\|\sum_{k>d}\frac{P_j\Delta P_k\Delta P_{>d}}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k}\right\|_2^2 + R_1,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}R_1 =& 4\sum_{j\leqslant d}(\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})\mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_{d+1}-\lambda_{d+1} > (\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1})/2\big)\\ &+ 32\sum_{j\leqslant d}\frac{\|P_j\Delta P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{\lambda_j-\lambda_{d+1}}\mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{\leqslant d}\Delta S_{\leqslant d}\|_\infty > 1/16\big)\end{aligned}$$

$$+ 128 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{1}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1}} \left\| \sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta P_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1}. \tag{H.4}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}(\lambda_d) \\
&\leqslant 16 \sum_{k>d} \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{\|P_k \Delta P_j\|_2^2}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} + 128 \sum_{k>d} \frac{1}{\lambda_d - \lambda_k} \left\| \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{P_k \Delta P_j \Delta P_{\leqslant d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2 + R_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2 =& 4 \sum_{k>d} (\lambda_d - \lambda_k) \mathbb{1}\big(\hat{\lambda}_d - \lambda_d < -(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)/2\big) \\
&+ 32 \sum_{k>d} \frac{\|P_k \Delta P_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2}{\lambda_d - \lambda_k} \mathbb{1}\big(\|S_{>d} \Delta S_{>d}\|_\infty > 1/16\big) \\
&+ 128 \sum_{k>d} \frac{1}{\lambda_d - \lambda_k} \left\| \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{P_k \Delta P_j \Delta P_{>d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_2},
\end{aligned} \tag{H.5}$$

with $S_{>d} = S_{\geqslant d+1}(\lambda_d)$ from (3.10) and

$$\mathcal{E}_2 = \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k>d} \sum_{j \leqslant d} \frac{P_k \Delta P_j \Delta S_{>d}}{(\lambda_d - \lambda_k)^{1/2} (\lambda_j - \lambda_k)} \right\|_\infty^2 > 1/128 \right\}.$$

Combining these bounds with $\mathcal{E}_d^{PCA} \leqslant \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_d) + \mathcal{E}_{>d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1})$, the claim follows. □

Appendix I. Proof of Theorem 4.10

We have

$$\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 = 2\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = 2 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d} \rangle = 2 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \|P_j \hat{P}_{>d}\|_2^2.$$

Inserting (H.2) into the last term and applying the triangle inequality twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant\ & 4 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \left\| \sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \hat{P}_{>d}}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2 + 8 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \left\| \sum_{l>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l} \right\|_2^2 \\
&+ 8 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \left\| \sum_{k>d} \sum_{l>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta \hat{P}_l}{(\lambda_j - \hat{\lambda}_l)(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)} \right\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, on the event $\{\hat{\lambda}_{d+1} - \lambda_{d+1} \leqslant (\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1})/2\}$ we have

$$\|P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \leqslant 4 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{k>d} \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^2} + 32 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{l>d} \frac{\|P_j \Delta P_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_l\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2}$$

$$+ 32 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{l > d} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \left\| \sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta \hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2. \tag{I.1}$$

The second term on the right-hand side is equal to

$$32 \| S_{\leqslant d}^2 \Delta P_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2 = 32 \| S_{\leqslant d}^2 \Delta S_{\leqslant d} R_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2$$

which is bounded by

$$32 \| S_{\leqslant d}^2 \Delta S_{\leqslant d} \|_\infty^2 \| R_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2 \leqslant 32 \| S_{\leqslant d} \Delta S_{\leqslant d} \|_\infty^2 \frac{\| R_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2}{\lambda_d - \lambda_{d+1}}.$$

Similarly, the third term is bounded via

$$\begin{aligned}
&32 \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{l > d} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})^2} \left\| \sum_{k>d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta \hat{P}_l}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= 32 \left\| \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{k > d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta \hat{P}_{>d}}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)} \right\|_2^2 \\
&\leqslant 64 \left\| \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{k > d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta P_{>d}}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)} \right\|_2^2 \\
&+ 64 \left\| \sum_{j \leqslant d} \sum_{k > d} \frac{P_j \Delta P_k \Delta S_{\leqslant d}}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{d+1})(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)} \right\|_\infty^2 \| R_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting these bounds into (I.1) and using $\| R_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{>d} \|_2^2 = \mathcal{E}_{\leqslant d}^{PCA}(\lambda_{d+1})$ from (H.1), the claim follows. □

Appendix J. Proof of Proposition 2.2

We begin by recalling the following asymptotic result from multivariate analysis. By [12, Proposition 5], we have

$$\sqrt{n}\Delta = \sqrt{n}\Delta_n \xrightarrow{d} L = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sqrt{\lambda_j \lambda_k} \xi_{jk} (u_j \otimes u_k), \tag{J.1}$$

where the upper triangular coefficients ξ_{jk}, $k \geqslant j$ are independent and centered Gaussian random variables, with variance 1 for $k > j$ and variance 2 for $k = j$. The lower triangular coefficients ξ_{jk}, $k < j$ are determined by $\xi_{jk} = \xi_{kj}$. For $l = 1, \ldots, p$, let $I_l = \{j : \lambda_j = \lambda_l\}$,

$$Q_l = \sum_{j \in I_l} P_j, \text{ and } \hat{Q}_l = \sum_{j \in I_l} \hat{P}_j.$$

For $l \geqslant 1$, we have

$$Q_l L Q_l = \lambda_l \sum_{j,k \in I_l} \xi_{jk} (u_j \otimes u_k)$$

and the random matrix

$$M_l = (\xi_{jk})_{j,k\in I_l}$$

is a GOE matrix. It is well known (see e.g. [29]) that the eigenvalues of M_l (in decreasing order) have a joint density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m_l}_{\geqslant}$, where $m_l = |I_l|$, and that the matrix of the corresponding eigenvectors is distributed according to the Haar measure on the orthogonal group $O(m_l)$. It is easy to see that M_l and Q_lLQ_l have the same non-zero eigenvalues and that a matrix of eigenvectors of M_l gives the coefficients of a basis of eigenvectors of Q_lLQ_l with respect to the basis $(u_j)_{j\in I_l}$. In particular, with probability 1, Q_lLQ_l has rank m_l and all m_l non-zero eigenvalues are distinct. Let $(P_j^{Haar})_{j\in I_l}$ denote the corresponding spectral projectors (ordered such that the orthogonal projection onto the eigenvector corresponding to the largest non-zero eigenvalue appears first, and so forth). The following key observation is proved below.

J.1. **Lemma.** *We have*

$$(\sqrt{n}\Delta, \hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_p) \xrightarrow{d} (L, P_1^{Haar}, \dots, P_p^{Haar}).$$

Lemma J.1 implies Proposition 2.2. By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{d,n}^{PCA} = \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_j>\lambda_d}} (\lambda_j-\lambda_d)\frac{\|P_j\Delta\hat{P}_k\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\hat{\lambda}_k)^2} + \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_k<\lambda_d}} (\lambda_d-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_k\Delta\hat{P}_j\|_2^2}{(\hat{\lambda}_j-\lambda_k)^2}. \quad \text{(J.2)}$$

Using Lemma J.1, (J.2), the fact that $\hat{\lambda}_l \xrightarrow{a.s.} \lambda_l$ for all l (see [12, Proposition 2]), and the continuous mapping theorem, we thus conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} n\mathcal{E}_{d,n}^{PCA} \xrightarrow{d} & \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_j>\lambda_d,\lambda_k<\lambda_d}} \frac{\|P_jLP_k\|_2^2}{\lambda_j-\lambda_k} \\ & + \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_j>\lambda_d,\lambda_k=\lambda_d}} (\lambda_j-\lambda_d)\frac{\|P_jLP_k^{Haar}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2} \\ & + \sum_{\substack{j\leqslant d,k>d:\\ \lambda_j=\lambda_d,\lambda_k<\lambda_d}} (\lambda_d-\lambda_k)\frac{\|P_kLP_j^{Haar}\|_2^2}{(\lambda_j-\lambda_k)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used the identities $\sum_{j\in I_l} P_j^{Haar} = Q_l = \sum_{j\in I_l} P_j$ in the first summand of the limit. Further, note that the tuple $(P_j^{Haar})_{j\in I_d}$ is independent of $\{P_jLP_k : \lambda_j \neq \lambda_d \text{ or } \lambda_k \neq \lambda_d\}$. Hence, the random variables $\|P_jLP_k\|_2^2/(\lambda_j\lambda_k)$, $\|P_jLP_k^{Haar}\|_2^2/(\lambda_j\lambda_k)$, and $\|P_kLP_j^{Haar}\|_2^2/(\lambda_j\lambda_k)$ appearing in the above sums are independent and chi-square distributed. This gives Proposition 2.2. It remains to prove Lemma J.1.

Proof of Lemma J.1. Let $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ be a subset which contains for each $l \geq 1$ exactly one element of I_l. Then we have

$$(\sqrt{n}\Delta, (Q_l\sqrt{n}\Delta Q_l)_{l\in I}) \xrightarrow{d} (L, (Q_l L Q_l)_{l\in I}).$$

In [12, Section 2.2.1], it is shown that for each $l \in I$,

$$\hat{Q}_l\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Sigma} - \lambda_l I)\hat{Q}_l - Q_l\sqrt{n}\Delta Q_l \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{J.3}$$

By Slutsky's lemma, we thus have

$$(\sqrt{n}\Delta, (\hat{Q}_l\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Sigma} - \lambda_l I)\hat{Q}_l)_{l\in I}) \xrightarrow{d} (L, (Q_l L Q_l)_{l\in I}). \tag{J.4}$$

We now apply the continuous mapping theorem. For $l \in I$, let h_l be a mapping sending a symmetric $p \times p$ matrix of rank m_l to the spectral projectors corresponding to the m_l non-zero eigenvalues (ordered such that the orthogonal projection onto the eigenvector corresponding to the largest non-zero eigenvalue appears first, and so forth). Note that this map is uniquely determined and continuous if restricted to the open subset of symmetric matrices of rank m_l having distinct non-zero eigenvalues. As already argued above, with probability 1, $Q_l L Q_l$ has rank m_l and all m_l non-zero eigenvalues are distinct. Moreover, since X is Gaussian, the same is true for $\hat{Q}_l\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Sigma} - \lambda_l I)\hat{Q}_l$. Thus, the claim follows from [7, Theorem 2.7] applied to $h = (I, (h_l)_{l\in I})$. □

Appendix K. Some facts on self-adjoint operators

Let $S : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a compact and self-adjoint linear operator and let $\lambda_1(S) \geqslant \lambda_2(S) \dots$ be its positive eigenvalues, each repeated a number of times equal to its multiplicity. This sequence is either finite or converges to zero. The min-max theorem states (see e.g. [22]) that for each k, $\lambda_k(S)$ can be written as

$$\lambda_k(S) = \min_{\dim V = k-1} \max_{\substack{\|x\|\leqslant 1 \\ x\perp V}} \langle Sx, x\rangle. \tag{K.1}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\lambda_k(S) = \max_{\dim V = k} \min_{\substack{\|x\|\leqslant 1 \\ x\in V}} \langle Sx, x\rangle. \tag{K.2}$$

Moreover, for each k, we have the following variational characterization of partial traces

$$\lambda_1(S) + \dots + \lambda_k(S) = \max_{\dim V = k} \operatorname{tr}(SP_V), \tag{K.3}$$

where P_V denotes the orthogonal projection onto V. If $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional, then one can order all eigenvalues of S as $\lambda_1(S) \geqslant \lambda_2(S) \dots \geqslant \lambda_p(S)$. In this case formulas (K.1)-(K.3) hold for $k = 1, \dots, p$ (i.e. not only for the positive eigenvalues).

We write $S \geqslant 0$ if S is positive, i.e. if $\langle Sx, x\rangle \geqslant 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

Appendix L. Some simple formulae

Directly from the definitions of P_j, $\hat{P}_k$ the following simple formulae are derived:

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_k\rangle = \langle u_j \otimes u_j, \hat{u}_k \otimes \hat{u}_k\rangle = \langle u_j, \hat{u}_k\rangle^2 = \|P_j \hat{P}_k\|_2^2 \in [0,1] \tag{L.1}$$

$$\langle P_j, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle = \sum_{k>d} \langle u_j, \hat{u}_k\rangle^2 \in [0,1] \text{ and } \langle P_k, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \in [0,1] \tag{L.2}$$

$$\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d}\rangle = \langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{>d} - P_{>d}\rangle = -\langle P_{>d}, P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle = \langle P_{>d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle \tag{L.3}$$

$$\langle P_{\leqslant d}, \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(P_{\leqslant d} P_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} \hat{P}_{\leqslant d}) = \|P_{\leqslant d}\hat{P}_{\leqslant d}\|_2^2 \in [0,d] \tag{L.4}$$

$$I = P_{\leqslant d} + P_{>d} = \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} + \hat{P}_{>d} \text{ and } P_{\leqslant d} - \hat{P}_{\leqslant d} = \hat{P}_{>d} - P_{>d}. \tag{L.5}$$

Moreover, for Hilbert-Schmidt operators S, we have

$$\textstyle\sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} \|P_j S\|_2^2 = \left\|\sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} P_j S\right\|_2^2 \text{ and } \sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} \|S P_j\|_2^2 = \left\|\sum_{j=j_0}^{j_1} S P_j\right\|_2^2. \tag{L.6}$$

References

[1] G. W. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An introduction to random matrices*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[2] T. W. Anderson. Asymptotic theory for principal component analysis. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 34:7122–148, 1963.

[3] T. W. Anderson. *An introduction to multivariate statistical analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1984.

[4] J. Baik, Gerard Ben Arous, and S. Péché. Phase transition of the largest eigenvalue for nonnull complex sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.*, 33:1643–1697, 2005.

[5] P. L. Bartlett, O. Bousquet, and S. Mendelson. Local rademacher complexities. *Ann. Statist.*, 33:1497–1537, 2005.

[6] B. Bercu, B. Delyon, and E. Rio. *Concentration inequalities for sums and martingales*. Springer, Cham, 2015.

[7] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999.

[8] G. Blanchard, O. Bousquet, and L. Zwald. Statistical properties of kernel principal component analysis. *Mach. Learn.*, 66:259–294, 2007.

[9] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration inequalities. A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.

[10] T. Cai, Z. Ma, and Y. Wu. Sparse PCA: optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, 41:3074–3110, 2013.

[11] T. Cai, Z. Ma, and Y. Wu. Optimal estimation and rank detection for sparse spiked covariance matrices. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 161:781–815, 2015.

[12] J. Dauxois, A. Pousse, and Y. Romain. Asymptotic theory for the principal component analysis of a vector random function: some applications to statistical inference. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 12:136–154, 1982.

[13] P. Hall and M. Hosseini-Nasab. Theory for high-order bounds in functional principal components analysis. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 146:225–256, 2009.

[14] M. Jirak. Optimal eigen expansions and uniform bounds. *Probab. Theory Related Fields, to appear*, 2015.

[15] I. M. Johnstone. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *Ann. Statist.*, 29:295–327, 2001.
[16] V. Koltchinskii and E. Giné. Random matrix approximation of spectra of integral operators. *Bernoulli*, 6:113–167, 2000.
[17] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Concentration inequalities and moment bounds for sample covariance operators. *Bernoulli, to appear*, 2014.
[18] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Asymptotics and concentration bounds for bilinear forms of spectral projectors of sample covariance. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, to appear*, 2015.
[19] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. Normal approximation and concentration of spectral projectors of sample covariance. *Ann. Statist., to appear*, 2015.
[20] V. Koltchinskii and K. Lounici. New asymptotic results in principal component analysis. https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.01457, 2016.
[21] V. I. Koltchinskii. Asymptotics of spectral projections of some random matrices approximating integral operators. In *High dimensional probability*, volume 43 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 191–227. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.
[22] P. D. Lax. *Functional analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, 2002.
[23] M. Ledoux. *The concentration of measure phenomenon*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2001.
[24] M. Ledoux. Deviation inequalities on largest eigenvalues. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, Lecture Notes in Math., 1910, pages 167–219. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
[25] A. Mas and F. Ruymgaart. High-dimensional principal projections. *Complex Anal. Oper. Theory*, 9:35–63, 2015.
[26] M. W. Meckes. Concentration of norms and eigenvalues of random matrices. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 211:508–524, 2004.
[27] B. Nadler. Finite sample approximation results for principal component analysis: a matrix perturbation approach. *Ann. Statist.*, 36:2791–2817, 2008.
[28] J. Shawe-Taylor, C. Williams, N. Cristianini, and J. Kandola. On the eigenspectrum of the gram matrix and its relationship to the operator eigenspectrum. In *Algorithmic learning theory*, volume 2533 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 23–40. Springer, Berlin, 2002.
[29] T. Tao. *Topics in random matrix theory*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2012.
[30] V. Vu and J. Lei. Minimax sparse principal subspace estimation in high dimensions. *Ann. Statist.*, 41:2905–2947, 2013.
[31] Y. Yu, T. Wang, and R. J. Samworth. A useful variant of the Davis-Kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika*, 102:315–323, 2015.
[32] L. Zwald and G. Blanchard. On the convergence of eigenspaces in kernel principal component analysis. In Y. Weiss, B. Schölkopf, and J. C. Platt, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 18*, pages 1649–1656. MIT Press, 2006.

Institut für Mathematik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany.

E-mail address: mreiss@math.hu-berlin.de and martin.wahl@math.hu-berlin.de